

SEP 13 '48P

THE MONTH

JULY-AUGUST, 1943

Vol. CLXXIX

EIGHTIETH YEAR

No. 934

CONTENTS

COMMENTS	<i>By the Editor</i>	Page 241
EAST AND WEST : The Photian Schism : A Re-Statement of Facts	<i>By F. Dvornik</i>	257
THE MYSTICAL BODY	<i>By R. H. J. Steuart</i>	271
QUEEN OF PEACE (<i>Verse</i>)	<i>By T. C.</i>	276
THE FUTURE OF THE ISLAMIC WORLD	<i>By Humphrey J. T. Johnson</i>	277
FOR A SAILOR (<i>Verse</i>)	<i>By Helen Nicholson</i>	283
THE SOURCES OF THE BEVERIDGE REPORT	<i>By Lewis Watt</i>	284
MISCELLANEA		292
I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES.		
England's Legion of Lost Churches.		
Fra Pozzo.		
II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES.		
REVIEWS		298
1.—(1) The Final Victory (Present Problems Series). <i>By Dom Aelred Graham, O.S.B.</i> (2) The Crisis of the Modern World. <i>By René Guénon.</i> Translated by Arthur Osborne. 2.—The Bible and the Early History of Mankind. <i>By Humphrey J. T. Johnson.</i> 3.—(1) King James the Last. (2) England for Sale. Both books <i>by Jane Lane.</i> 4.—The Popes' New Order : Social Encyclicals and Addresses, 1878-1941. A Systematic Summary. <i>By Philip Hughes.</i>		
SHORT NOTICES		305

PUBLISHED BY LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.

43 Albert Drive, London, S.W.19

EDITORIAL OFFICES :

114 Mount Street, London, W.1

MANAGER'S ADDRESS :

Manresa Press, Roehampton, S.W.15, to which Annual Subscriptions,
14s. post free (U.S.A. \$3.50), should be sent.

TWO SHILLINGS NET

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

THE WESTMINSTER VERSION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES. *A New Translation from the Original Greek and Hebrew Texts.* GENERAL EDITORS : The Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., Professor of Fundamental Theology at Heythrop College, Oxon, and The Rev. John Murray, S.J., Editor of "The Month."

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN FOUR VOLUMES

VOLUME I—CONTENTS : THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW—THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK—THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE, BY THE VERY REV. JOSEPH DEAN, D.D., PH.D. CHRONOLOGY AND HARMONY OF THE LIFE OF CHRIST, BY THE REV. CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J. 8vo. cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

VOLUME II—CONTENTS : THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN, BY THE REV. W. S. REILLY, S.S., S.T.D. THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, BY THE REV. CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J. 8vo. cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

VOLUME III—CONTENTS : THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS, BY THE REV. CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J. THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS, BY THE REV. CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J., AND THE REV. JOSEPH KEATING, S.J. THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS, BY THE REV. ALEXANDER KEOGH, S.J. THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS, BY THE REV. CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J. THE EPISTLES OF THE CAPTIVITY. EPHESIANS AND COLOSSIANS, BY THE REV. JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. PHILEMON AND PHILIPPIANS, BY THE MOST REV. ALBAN GOODIER, S.J. 8vo. cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

VOLUME IV—CONTENTS : THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, BY THE REV. PATRICK BOYLAN, D.LITT., D.D. THE PASTORAL AND JOHANNINE EPISTLES ; THE APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN, BY THE REV. FRANCIS GIGOT, S.T.D. THE EPISTLES OF SS. JAMES, PETER, JUDE, BY THE REV. W. H. KENT, O.S.C. 8vo. cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.,
43 ALBERT DRIVE, LONDON, S.W.19

THE MONTH

VOL. CLXXIX

JULY—AUGUST, 1943

No. 934

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

Why Doesn't the Pope—?

HOW frequently sentences begin like that these days—for instance, two or three weeks ago on the B.B.C. Anvil, and regularly in local Brains' Trusts and ordinary conversation! Why doesn't the Pope do this, that or the other? Why doesn't he stop the war? Or forbid all Catholics, but especially German and Italian Catholics, to take any further part in it? Or excommunicate Hitler and Mussolini? Often, no doubt, these queries are put mischievously or unpleasantly, more to annoy than have an answer. In that case, it is simple enough to reply that the persons who posit these questions are giving to the Holy Father greater powers and prerogatives than Catholics ever venture to claim for him. Catholics have a very clear and consistent notion about the status of the Head of the Church. They are perfectly certain, for instance, that Pius IX was in a position to define the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. In quite another order, they are just as convinced that Pope Pius XII cannot stop the war *tout court*. It is a trifle curious that Englishmen who deny altogether the spiritual authority of the Holy See, must go thrusting upon it terrestrial powers which it either does not claim or, even could it claim some of them, certainly could not use. This notion is partly a relic of the old Protestant belief that, in Catholic eyes, the Holy Father could do everything and anything; that Catholics are from birth so "priest-ridden" and, even worse, so "Pope-ridden," that they do exactly, and under all circumstances, whatever they are told to do by priest and Pontiff. To-day there is the subsidiary idea that, now that Britain is engaged in a war that can be justified on Christian principles, this massive authority of the Holy See should be enlisted on its behalf. To keep the argument for the moment on this plane of the concrete, one might suggest one or two counter-questions. Would you, for example, have been completely happy if Pope Leo XIII had ordered British Catholics to take no part in the Boer War, on the grounds that it was unjust? The great majority of British Catholics did hold that opinion. Or, to take one case from the war of 1914-1918, would you have quite approved, had Pope Benedict XV condemned Italy's entry into that war which was motived by exactly the same considerations that led Italy into the present war? This time it was France, then it was Austria-Hungary that was "stabbed in the back." Once you

put positive questions of the kind to the Holy See, you expose yourself to positive answers and to some awkward parallels. Besides, if you are so anxious to allow the Holy See this wide power of intervention, why draw the line at strictly international questions? But would you be contented if the Pope were to criticise British rule in India or comment upon conditions in Northern Ireland? In other words, you cannot expect to enlist the Papacy as an ally, when it suits you, and ignore it when it would not be so convenient. Yet this is what people are always trying to do.

The Position of the Pope

THE Pope is, first and foremost, a spiritual ruler, the Head on earth of the Church of Christ. He is the descendant of St. Peter—that rock on which the Church was established, the chief shepherd appointed to pasture the Christian flock. He is heir to the authority and prerogatives of St. Peter. To him is given the special responsibility of teaching Christ's truth and of safeguarding that truth from false interpretation and positive error; and with that responsibility is conjoined an *assistance* or guidance of the Holy Spirit. He is the supreme Pastor, with full jurisdiction and authority: and throughout the world Catholics acknowledge this pre-eminent position of the Holy Father, his primacy, his measure of infallibility, his spiritual authority. Under certain very special circumstances he can define a doctrine concerning faith or morals as belonging to the deposit of faith and consequently as demanding the assent of all members of the Church. But, quite apart from these special circumstances, the Pope teaches with authority; and his teaching is not limited to what is strictly and narrowly theological. He can give authoritative guidance—and recent Popes have done this exhaustively—upon the application of Christian ideas and principles to social, political and economic problems, upon the Christian notion of society, the relation between individuals, families and States, and the mutual relationship between States themselves. The splendid series of Papal encyclicals, from Leo XIII to Pius XII, have left very few of these subjects untouched and unilluminated. False and dangerous theories have been studied and censured, whether these have been the "Liberalism" of the late nineteenth century or Communism (in *Divini Redemptoris*) or Nazi ideology (in *Mit brennender Sorge*) or, finally, the excesses of Italian Fascism (in *Non Abbiamo Bisogno*).

Pope Pius XI

TO-DAY the Holy See insists upon the right—and recently has made ample use of it—to speak its mind, at least by protest and warning, when the rights of the Church or the natural liberties

of the human person are outraged. It is never a purely political intervention ; it is an obligation, incumbent upon the Papacy, since it has the mission of proclaiming truth, justice and world-wide charity. Pius XI made the position abundantly clear in his encyclical, *Ubi Arcano Dei*, when he wrote :

The Church was established by her Founder as a perfect society, the mistress and leader of other societies ; such being the case, she will not encroach upon the authority of other societies, which are each of them legitimate in their own sphere, but she will be able felicitously to complete them, as grace perfects nature. . . . But if the Church considers it improper to meddle without reason in the government of worldly affairs and with purely political matters, she is within her rights in seeking to prevent the civil power making that an excuse to oppose in any way whatsoever the superior interests which involve man's eternal salvation, to endanger or injure those interests by unjust laws or commands, to attack the divine constitution of the Church, or to tread underfoot the sacred rights of God in the civil society of men.

It was the same Pope, Pius XI, who so often translated this principle into practical effect, in his refutation of the false doctrines of Communism or Nazism and in his reiterated defence of the Jews from racial persecution. One passage from Dr. Binchy's valuable work on "Church and State in Fascist Italy" (in no sense an uncritical eulogy of Pius XI) calls for quotation. It speaks of the Pope, in his last years, with the following glowing terms :

Yet it seemed that no tribulation could break that dauntless spirit or even halt it for a second on the path of duty. In the sunset of his life he stands, as it were, transfigured on the horizon, the living embodiment of the charity of Christ, pleading in the name of his Master the cause of the persecuted Jews. Racked with pain, heedless of the insults that rained on him from the Nazi and the Fascist press, he fought on to the close, thundering against the "hateful doctrines" of racialism and exaggerated nationalism, and proclaiming the universality of the Christian message to all men and nations.

But Why the Vatican ?

DOES this explain—the questioner might continue—the Vatican, the Papal Secretariate of State, the various nuncios and ambassadors ? Well, ask yourself why Governments and countries accredit representatives to the Holy See. Surely not because, prior to 1870, he was the temporal sovereign of the small Papal States or that to-day he is the temporal lord of the Vatican City that might comfortably be put inside St. James's Park. Owing to the Holy Father's special position as Head of the Church, he is necessarily brought into contact with secular authorities. It is on the good will or at least the tolerance of various Governments that the mission of the Church must, to some extent, depend for its effect. There are

certain conditions which must be fulfilled if the Church is adequately to pursue her spiritual mission in any particular country. She must enjoy freedom of worship, freedom to teach and preach, liberty to erect churches and religious houses. She must be free in the training of her clergy and the appointment of bishops, and free also to secure Catholic education for Catholic children. Further, the whole of the Church's foreign missionary work is clearly dependent upon the favour of secular Powers. Consequently, the first purpose of the diplomacy of the Holy See is to watch over the spiritual interests of the Church, and the many and varied activities involved therein. This means that the Holy See will attempt to secure as favourable conditions as possible for the Catholic Church, as it exists and works in different countries. During this century the practice has grown of fixing the relation between the Catholic Church and secular Governments by means of a Concordat. Concordats are no new invention. There were Concordats earlier, for example with Poland, Spain, Portugal and nine Italian States during the eighteenth century. In the last two decades such Concordats have been drawn up and signed with Latvia (1922), Bavaria (1924), Poland (1925), Rumania (1927), Italy (1929, on the occasion of the Lateran Treaty), Prussia (also in 1929), Austria (1933), Germany (1933), Spain and Portugal (1940).

The Popes and Peace

A SECOND major purpose of the Holy See's diplomacy is to encourage and promote peace between States and peoples. War is the father of hatred ; the Church must be the harbinger of charity and peace. Consequently, in a world society that recognized the proper position of the Holy See, it would enjoy a special status as arbiter between different Powers. This was, in fact, the accepted theory during the Middle Ages, however much practice may have lagged behind. Acknowledged then throughout Christendom as Head of the Church and as possessing great moral authority, the Pope was frequently able to intervene in the cause of peace. He did not claim a direct temporal authority except in certain peculiar cases. But an indirect temporal authority was admitted. Popes were able, for instance, to forbid private war among the feudal nobility from Wednesday to Monday and on Feast Days. The number of disputes submitted to the Holy See for arbitration was remarkable. In the thirteenth century there were a hundred cases in Italy alone. But even then Christendom never became a theocracy. When the notion and fact of Christendom began to disintegrate, there disappeared also the concept of the Holy See as its moral and religious centre. Sixteenth century writers, like Vittoria and Suarez, could still declare that, *with Christian rulers*, the Papacy enjoyed a right of intervention ; but they cautiously added that the Pope

might refrain from its use "lest greater evils should follow." Then came the era of the absolute national State, knowing no moral law higher than itself and acknowledging no international law that was more than the result of agreement and convention. Implicitly, and sometimes quite explicitly, these States abandoned the old Christian idea of a Natural Law in human relationships, that is the reflection of the Law of God Himself.

More Recent Experiences

PAPAL prestige in international affairs, that for some time was obscured if not very nearly eclipsed, began to grow again in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Pius IX offered mediation to avert the Franco-Prussian war; and Leo XIII was partly instrumental in summoning the First Hague conference. But here let it be noted that, when the Czar of Russia, supported by the Queen of Holland, proposed that the Holy See be invited to send a representative to the conference, this proposal was challenged by Italy; and Italy's objection was upheld by Great Britain. One of the clauses in the Treaty of London, negotiated by Italy and the Allies prior to Italy's declaration of war against the Central Powers in 1915, carefully excluded the Holy See from the subsequent Peace congress. In article 5 of the Treaty, France, Britain and Russia pledged themselves "to support Italy in preventing the representatives of the Holy See from taking any steps whatever in regard to the conclusion of peace or the settlement of questions connected with the present war." Despite this secret clause which reflects little credit upon its signatories and incidentally shows how complicated can be the question "Why doesn't the Pope?", Pope Benedict XV did intervene. The time was the late summer of 1917. The story is interesting, in itself, as also because the peace emissary dispatched by the Pope to the Central Powers was the newly-consecrated Archbishop Pacelli, now Pius XII. Mgr. Pacelli interviewed both Kaisers, of Germany and Austria-Hungary, to whom he presented the Holy Father's proposals. In the long run, these were declined, both by the Central Powers and by France and Britain. Since then, the Holy See was not invited to play any part in the League of Nations. Its practical position to-day is illustrated from article 24 of the Lateran Treaty concluded with the Italian Government. This article reads as follows:

The Holy See, in regard to the sovereignty that belongs to it in the international field, declares that it desires to remain and will remain outside all temporal competitions between other States and outside international congresses held for such objects, *save when the contending parties unite in appealing to its mission of peace*, always reserving to itself the right of bringing its moral and spiritual power to bear on any given case.

As a matter of fact, the last half century or so has witnessed a number

of examples of Papal intervention or arbitration. The Holy See acted as judge between Germany and Spain in 1885, in the conflict concerning the Caroline Islands; in 1893, in the boundary quarrel between Ecuador and Peru, and in the following year, in a dispute of a similar kind between Great Britain and Venezuela. It arbitrated between Haiti and San Domingo, in 1895, and, from 1900 to 1903, between Chile and the Argentine, while its appeal, in 1898, delayed the outbreak of the Spanish-American war. In 1906 and from 1909-10 its aid was requested in difficulties between Columbia and Ecuador, and between Brazil and both Bolivia and Peru. In 1905 an agreement was concluded between Columbia and Peru to submit to Papal arbitration all future disputes (except those concerning independence and honour), that should prove to be unamenable to direct negotiation.

Pius XII and this War

WHAT, it may finally be urged, has Pius XII done during, and just prior to, the present war? Throughout the years and months that led up to it, both Pius XI and Pius XII worked for peace—sometimes by warning, at other times through appeal and exhortation, and always by diplomatic action. Those who would like to have detailed information about the diplomatic action of Pius XII on behalf of peace, will find it, in convenient form, either in Mr. Charles Rankin's compilation of Papal addresses and broadcasts, called "The Pope Speaks" or in the fourth chapter of Mr. A. C. F. Beales's admirable Penguin volume on "The Catholic Church and International Order." It is difficult to see what the Pope could conceivably have done that he did not actually attempt. In the second place, he has emphasized positively the proper basis of a true and lasting peace. The "Five Peace Points" of the Pope were first issued in the Christmas Eve allocution of 1939. These were included in the famous joint letter to the *Times* of December 21st, 1940, signed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council, as well as by Cardinal Hinsley. The letter included these five points or paragraphs as basic to any true and genuinely Christian peace settlement. The principles laid down in the 1939 allocution have been repeatedly explained and enlarged in subsequent addresses. They have been illuminated also in a long series of authoritative articles which appeared in 1942 and 1943 in the *Osservatore Romano*, from the pen of Professor Guido Gonella. Negatively, the Pope has continued to stress and condemn the errors and evils that have led to this new war and that have generally corrupted modern society. The encyclical, *Summi Pontificatus*, issued on October 28th, 1939, gave a profound analysis of the world's unrest and of the war that was both its consequence and its symptom. Man must find again—said the

Pontiff—the understanding of the Natural Law ; he must rediscover that sense of human solidarity and brotherhood under God and in Christ ; he must abandon the false and dangerous worship of State and human society which bids it turn away from higher moral and religious values. The Pope has stressed evil, in theory and in fact ; he has emphasized good and outlined, in far greater detail than any statesman of the present day, the principles which should underlie the peace settlement after the war. Further, he has devoted himself to an amelioration of the hardship that war inevitably brings and which this war has brought, especially upon the continent of Europe, in startling and appalling measure. Relief work, the care of prisoners of war—to which purposes have been harnessed all the resources of the Vatican and its diplomatic representatives all over the world—these are two of the major war-time activities of the Holy See. But it waits ; it remains ever ready to help when its help is asked for ; it stands adamant upon the old Christian foundation of international relations, so sadly ignored for more than two centuries, and still more flagrantly violated in these our days. The Axis Powers seem to understand the position far more clearly than do our questioners. The Nazi Press is suspicious of the Vatican always, and at times violently opposed to it ; and, for the Italian Fascists, the extremists, such as Farinacci, constantly attacked what they termed reactionaries at the Vatican, meaning, of course, and being understood to mean, the Holy Father himself. One consoling feature of war-time has been the development of very close relations between the Holy See and the United States. And also it is widely known that the Holy Father hopes a great deal from the general influence of North America and from the development of Catholicism throughout the Americas. When the United Nations invaded Sicily, it was left to President Roosevelt to send a special message—of great cordiality and sympathy—to the Pope.

China's Seventh Year of War

ON the night of July 7th, 1937, Japanese troops attacked the Chinese garrison at Wanping, near Peking—and so began the first of the wars that make up our world conflict of to-day. It was not the first clash between Japan and China. Taking advantage of China's domestic unrest and divisions, the Japanese had previously penetrated into Mongolia and had occupied Manchuria. Tokyo cynically pretended that this supposed attack of July 7th was not an attack at all, but merely a piece of routine manoeuvres ; but she was now forced to large-scale attacks to punish the Chinese Army and to uphold her own military prestige. During the summer of 1937 the Japanese forces gained striking victories in northern China and secured a hold upon Peking and Tientsin, with all the railway lines connecting them with the South. In August, they attacked

the Chinese at Shanghai and began a drive along the Yangtze river aimed at the Chinese capital, Nanking. Chiang Kai-Shek moved his Government further inland to Hankow. When this city was, in its turn, threatened by the Japanese advance, he went still further westward up the Yangtze to Chungking: it is from Chungking that Chinese resistance is organized and directed to-day. The first fifteen months of the war proved consistently disastrous for the Chinese. Their chief cities fell to the enemy, e.g. Peking, Tientsin, Shanghai, Nanking, Hankow and Canton, as did most of their industrial areas. One by one, their supply routes were cut; the last to go were the roads through Indo-China and over Burma. Despite the alarming war situation Chiang Kai-Shek could appeal to his people (on December 16th, 1937) as follows:—"No matter how the present situation may change we must not surrender. . . . To capitulate is to court disaster. . . . We are convinced that the present situation is favourable to China. Prolonged resistance is not to be found in Nanking . . . but in the villages throughout China and in the fixed determination of the people. The time must come when Japan's military strength will be completely exhausted, thus giving us ultimate victory." There was in this manifesto something of the note of "blood and tears," to be sounded more than two years later by Mr. Churchill. The Chinese people have suffered severely. But the Japanese plan to paralyse their vast country by defeating the Chinese armies and dissipating its central Government has failed. The Japanese reached their peak point in October, 1938, with the capture of Hankow. China's "scorched earth" policy and the rapid transference of industrial plant into the interior robbed the invader of many of the fruits of conquest. And even in the territories which they more or less control, the Japanese are forced to keep to the towns and railways: local Chinese rule still functions in the more remote districts of the supposedly occupied provinces. They have not yet solved, nor are they likely to solve, the problem of the Chinese guerrillas working behind their own lines. A recent Tokyo comment stated: "The Chungking troops are like mushrooms or flies. When they are wiped out by the Japanese, they disappear for a few weeks but afterwards come out again."

Their Sixth Year of War

SINCE 1938 the Chinese have succeeded in resisting the Japanese attack. Their tactics have been elastic. They were rarely sufficiently strong in material to risk a frontal battle, but they have worn away and exhausted the enemy by their subtle tactics. The help of American airmen and the development of a native Chinese Air Force is beginning to challenge Japanese air supremacy. Chinese troops fought in Burma under American leadership. Early in 1943

it was announced from Tokyo that the Japanese would employ "all conceivable means to crush Chungking." The Japanese are obsessed with the possibility of air-attacks upon Japan from Chinese air fields. New advances were planned, attacks were launched: but the Chinese defenders were able to repel them. There have been Chinese victories this summer at Shihpai and Yuyangkwan. However, it is important to remember that the Chinese are still fighting under the gravest difficulties. The problem of air support has been partially solved; the other problem of equipment remains acute. Madame Chiang Kai-Shek has been warning the United States that China cannot continue indefinitely without far more substantial assistance in modern armament and weapons. It is interesting to note how prominent a part is being played in this national resistance by Chinese Christians. Chiang Kai-Shek is the most conspicuous among their number. But Bishop Paul Yü Pin, the Catholic Vicar Apostolic of Nanking, is a member of the Chinese National Council. At the moment, he is in the United States. Incidentally, one of the most picturesque of modern Chinese Catholics is Lou Tseng Tsiang, once Prime Minister of China and now a Benedictine priest in an abbey in Belgium. The apostolic progress of the Church in China during this century has been remarkable. In May, 1941, Madame Chiang Kai-Shek wrote of Catholic missionaries in the following terms: "Their life of self-denial and inner discipline has proved to be a source of inspiring courage to all those they serve and with whom they suffer." Speaking on the seventh anniversary of the war, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek predicted the complete defeat of the Axis Powers within two years and hinted at the severe problems with which the Japanese were now confronted. The Secretary of the Kuomintang party also declared that China's rôle in the world of to-morrow is to be an important one.

China of old was a source of wisdom for the West; young China with her new status will be in a position to make a vital contribution towards the establishment of a sane progressive world. The important part which China is playing as a member of the United Nations fighting against the aggressors predestines her to play an equally vital part in the post-war world. . . . The peace will be won, if we will it so, just as the war is now being won. When peace reigns again on earth it will be our sacred duty zealously to safeguard and maintain that peace. In that great task we shall not fail.

There are many things we do not know about China. As in Russia, there is evidence of a strong nationalistic movement in China, provoked by the Japanese invasion. And then the relations of China with Russia, as well as of Russia with Japan, are not clear. None the less we can salute—and we should most certainly salute—the patient and courageous resistance of our Chinese allies. Bishop Paul Yü Pin addressed the United States Congress in May, two days

before Mr. Churchill did so. He spoke of his country's great confidence in the United States: "It is this great faith in the people of the United States, this great hope in the promises of the American Government, that keeps our Chinese soldiers fighting and suffering and dying for the common Allied cause." And, more recently, it has been announced from Chungking that Pope Pius XII has sent a letter to Lin Sen, President of the Chinese Republic, who is at present gravely ill, "saying that he will do his utmost to promote closer relations between China and the Vatican, and expressing his earnest hope that peace will return before long to the world."

Echoes from France

THERE are many indications, both from the controlled press of France and from statements of French Catholics, that the latter are finding it very difficult to adjust themselves to the present domestic situation. A Swiss paper, published in Neuchâtel, quotes Marcel Déat as threatening "the Church which acts as a partisan faction" and another writer, Georges Cuarez, as declaring that certain Church dignitaries are showing a taste for conspiracy and a determination to remain neutral that borders upon opposition. *Le Cri du Peuple* of June 26th publishes a speech made at a Marseilles congress by Alain Janvier, that included the following paragraph. Even when allowance is made for rhetoric and exaggeration, it shows that the relations between the Church and the civil administration are none too happy.

We can well imagine that the French Catholic hierarchy, which since 1905 has been free of any obligation towards the State but which for three years has been favoured by substantial advantages and measures of redress, might soon take sides against the Government and spread distrust and disorder in people's minds, ruining the authority of the Government. This is definitely what has been happening for six months. First of all, the clergy strongly reprovved the measures taken against the Jews. Then they raised doubts about Bolshevik barbarity, and finally, the pulpits are declaiming against that measure of public salvation (*salut public*), the requisitioning of French labour.

L'Action Française, for July 3rd, quoted a letter which asserted that priests with strong de Gaullist and pro-British sentiments were being given important posts in colleges and seminaries, and placed at the head of charitable organizations. A few days previously, it discussed at length a circular sent by their chaplain to one branch of the *Jeunesse Etudiante Catholique*. The circular declared that, in the chaplain's opinion, there no longer existed any duty of loyalty to the Vichy Government. This Government was no longer free and was not working for the national good: "in addition, the present policy of the Government is certainly not in harmony with the general feeling of the country, nor with the almost unanimous will of the

French people." The conclusion is that the French citizen is not bound by any duty of civil or political obedience: "the right to serve, if his conscience demands it, the dissident authorities, can be denied to no one." Finally, the circular outlines the position that the youth movements should themselves adopt:

The movements need owe no definite loyalty towards the Vichy Government, but in so far as they are Catholic movements they have no right to penetrate into the political field. They must refrain from all political opposition to the Government, but by virtue of their citizenship they must work for the common good. They must carry out any activity of a strictly social character demanded by the Vichy Government, on condition that such activity does not compromise either the Church or themselves politically. It would be even more serious for the Church to compromise herself now, in view of the fact that the great majority of the various social classes are opposed to the policy of Vichy, and a compromise might isolate the Church from the mass of the people.

In recent sermons Père Victor Dillard, S.J., was even more outspoken and declared openly that for two years the Government had not done the slightest thing to restore France but had contented itself with shifting the blame for France's collapse.

The Silence of France

RECENTLY there came to this country a story, published originally in underground France as one of the secret "Editions de Minuit." It has now been reprinted here as the first of France's "Cahiers du Silence." *Silence*—that has become the watchword of French thought and life. *Silence*—because German troops are marching beneath the window; because a German officer is billeted in the house; because the Gestapo have their microphones everywhere; because children are afraid to say they are hungry; because every morning there is the rattle of musketry to tell them of deaths of French hostages. *Silence* of thought and expression. It is the story of a cultured German officer, living with a French family that will have no intercourse of speech with him. He praises France, is anxious to understand French ideas, but his advances are met all the time with silence. The French people—that is the idea conveyed—have wrapped themselves in this mantle of silence, so chilly and aloof. The Geneva paper, *La Suisse*, for July 8th, stresses this notion of French silence and solitude. "France is cloistered and cannot look outside, cannot put out of her mind the single pre-occupying problem, raised by the presence of the foreigners with all its consequences, economic disorganization, lack of food, the deportation of the youth." The newspapers are not read; official opinion is ignored. Foreign radios are listened to but their communiques are frequently garbled, as they are carried by word of mouth. "Thus a confused background is created, against which

the French invent dreams which end by becoming for them the only reality." But present conditions are not accepted. A miracle is awaited. Trains have the greatest difficulties in leaving for Germany with conscripted workers; frequently crowds form passive walls in front of the engines. "Black marketeers, Communists, Right-Wing objectors of the Parti Social Français, officers and priests are now found in the same internment camps. The appellation 'anti-national' which is given to all of them expresses their unity in process of formation. The people of France are no longer for this or that, but almost unanimously *against something*. The great hope born from distress is the Church, which is now nearer to the people. The Church has not taken sides politically. On the contrary, she continuously affirms her independence. But the constant re-affirmation of the value of the human personality centred on precise facts is a great lever of hope."

That Second Front

WHEN the Axis armies were defeated in Tunisia, it was claimed by enemy propaganda that they had already fulfilled the task allotted to them. This had been to allow time to the Axis Powers to bolt, bar and seal every invasion approach to the Fortress of Europe. No doubt, some of its approaches are very heavily guarded. And yet the first attempt made by the Allies has swung open a substantial back door into the fortress. The invasion of Sicily was planned carefully and carried out with a swift efficiency that is a good omen for future and larger operations. Allied supremacy at sea went completely unchallenged. The Italian fleet, to which the press of Italy sometimes gives the title of *la grande silenziosa*, was as silent as ever. Allied control of the air was almost as marked. The rapid decline of the Luftwaffe is striking. Even granted that the Germans are holding a large number of squadrons in reserve for the eventual defence of the German Reich, and also that they are not anxious to waste their dwindling air resources on behalf of their Axis partner, it is now clear that they are out-planed in the Mediterranean just as they have been forced on to the defensive in Western Europe. The Berlin correspondent of a Swedish newspaper declared, on July 13th, that a German workman of Dortmund had been sentenced to three years' penal servitude for suggesting publicly that a monument in honour of Goering should be erected in the Ruhr. Interesting too in the attack upon Sicily was the employment, on a large scale, of amphibious vehicles. The German press was at first inclined to dismiss the invasion as relatively unimportant. But, as the days passed, its tone altered; its accents became more serious and it made unwelcome admissions. By July 14th it stated that the Allies had landed ten divisions on the island. The German official news agency admitted, on that date, that the Allies had established a system of bases and that fighting was now

entering "an extremely difficult phase." The military commentator Sertorius, whose broadcasts need to be taken seriously, recognized that the Allies have large reserves of shipping that were not employed in the Sicilian attack and suggested that they will gradually throw in their entire African and Near Eastern forces, "and therefore the battle of Sicily is only the prelude and beginning of a gigantic test of power which may well spread over a wide front in the Mediterranean. The ten Allied divisions in Sicily are not even half of the Allies' African and Near Eastern war potential. So far they have used only two-thirds of their invasion tonnage—perhaps even less. Therefore the enemy can later on throw in reserves against Sicily or, alternatively, can attack any other point on the southern flank of Europe with forces at least as strong as—perhaps even several times stronger than—those used in Sicily." This is very different language from that current only a month ago, when a favourite theme for home consumption was the invulnerability of the European Fortress. The Italian press swings between the poles of epic over-statement (so noticeable during the African campaigns) and of a tragic appeal for resistance to the last man. When the Sicilian attack commenced, it dramatised the situation, with pictures of the Sicilian populace running down to the beaches to repel the invader. Yet it would be unwise to imagine that the Italian people can or will offer no serious resistance to a full attack upon their country. The Badoglio Government has rid Italy of Mussolini, and then possibly of Fascism altogether; but, at the same time, it declares that it will continue to wage war. We must simply wait upon events.

The Future of Italy

THE appeal addressed by President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill to the people of Italy was a stern document but it made careful distinction between Italy and Germany as also between the Italian people and their political leaders responsible for the alliance with Germany and for their country's entry into the war. An "Allied Military Government of Occupied Territories" (AMGOT) already functions where Allied armies are in control. Presumably, its authority will extend as the territory occupied increases. But what is to follow? "It would be a grave mistake," Mr. Churchill declared on July 26th, "when Italian affairs are in this flexible, fluid, formative condition for the rescuing Powers, Britain and the United States, so to act as to break down the whole structure and expression of the Italian State." He added that the Allies certainly were not seeking to reduce Italian life to chaos or anarchy. Our own press assumes too easily that there exists in Italy an underground "democratic" opposition which had but to be released from the incubus of Fascist oppression to function quite normally. Yet, within Italy, there is little evidence of such a formal opposition. Its spokesmen are frequently men who have been away from Italy for ten or fifteen years, those *fuorusciti*

educated in a "liberal" or Socialist tradition which may well awaken only tenuous echoes in the Italy of 1943. Besides, some of them speak in the language of *Ne Dio, ne Piemonte*, the language of anti-clerical Republicans of half a century back. They are violently opposed, not only to Fascism but also to the House of Savoy and the Catholic Church. A few weeks ago, there was published the programme of an anti-Fascist party which was to reunite all the opposition groups except the Communists. It styled itself the *Partito d' Azione*, and opted for the abolition of the monarchy, on the grounds that it had compromised itself hopelessly with the Fascist regime; it spoke, in its last point, of religious freedom. Now, Catholic liberty and activity have been hampered in many ways under Fascist rule, in spite of the favourable clauses of the Concordat of 1929. It was after, and not before, this Concordat that Pius XI issued his condemnation of Fascist excesses, in the letter "Non Abbiamo Bisogno." None the less, the expression "religious freedom"—admirable in itself—has previously cloaked in Italy violent attacks upon the Catholic Church. The Fascist attitude towards the Church has always been opportunist. It has paid lip service to Catholic ideas and has always recognized the prestige that accrues to Italy because of the presence in the Vatican of the Holy Father. And it had sense enough to know that the ordinary Italian, whatever his religious practice, has a simple attachment to the Church and the Holy See. Theoretically, Fascism would make the Church subservient to the State, much as would the French movement of *L'Action Française*. And yet foreigners who are anti-Catholic or blessed with little knowledge of the Catholic Church, have assumed that the sympathies of the Church in Italy—and still worse, of the Holy See—have been on the whole with the Italian Fascists. Even in his latest book, Mr. Sidney Dark returns to his familiar argument about the semi-alliance of the Papacy and the Fascist Powers. Well, he and others tempted to hold that opinion should study the Papal documents "Mit Brennender Sorge" and "Non Abbiamo Bisogno," as well as the earlier encyclicals on the true ordering of society, and should also listen to the transmissions broadcast in German from the Vatican Radio. However, the Fascists themselves tried to confuse the issue. Scorza, their Party secretary, appealed to his fellow-Italians to stand fast in the defence of their country and of the Catholic Church. Perhaps the best answer to this portion of his appeal, both for Italians and for the anti-Catholic critics outside Italy, is found in President Roosevelt's letter to the Pope at the moment of the invasion of Sicily.

The "Bomb Rome" Controversy

THE "Bomb Rome" controversy has at last been resolved. Rome has been bombed. Assuming that it is right to attack military objectives from the air, it is evident that there are military

objectives in Rome, and that Rome is the capital of modern Italy, an enemy Power. One cannot therefore condemn the policy of those who have decided at last to attack those objectives. The care taken to secure accurate bombing of military targets, the fact that pilots exposed themselves to additional danger to do this, the further fact that the attack was made by day and not by night—this all shows that care was indeed taken to see that no unnecessary and certainly no wanton damage was done. None the less, there is matter for regret in the decision, however grave may have been the reasons for taking it. Much of the clamour for bombing Rome came from circles in Britain as susceptible to anti-Catholic as to anti-Fascist ideas. But, on the other hand, it must be noted that many non-Catholics have expressed the hope that it would never take place, among them, in recent weeks, the Anglican Bishop and the Dean of Lichfield, and the editorial of the *New Statesman* (July 10th). Rome is the capital of modern Italy. But there are men and women still living in Britain who were children when Rome had been nothing but the city of the Popes for fifteen hundred years. You cannot glibly distinguish between the tiny Vatican City across the Tiber and the rest of Rome, as though that had now-a-days nothing to do with the Holy See. The very provisions of the Lateran Treaty show you that no such simple distinction is feasible. In the first place, in the city of Rome, certain edifices are expressly recognized as papal property: the Basilicas of St. John Lateran, St. Mary Major, and St. Paul's outside the Walls, and the buildings attached to each of them; the palace of San Callisto in Trastevere; the former conventual buildings attached to the churches of the Twelve Apostles, Sant' Andrea della Valle, and San Carlo ai Catinari; and the pontifical palace at Castel Gandolfo together with the Villa Barberini, now the summer residence of the Popes. A second group of buildings, such as those of the Cancelleria, the Dataria, the Propaganda, the Vicariate and the Holy Office, were accorded diplomatic immunities but were not specifically stated to be the property of the Holy See. Finally, a third class of buildings, consisting of the Papal Gregorian University, the Biblical Institute, and other pontifical colleges, were declared exempt from taxes and cannot be expropriated except with the special permission of the Pope. So widely scattered throughout Rome are these dependencies of the Vatican that a French writer has spoken of the shadow of the Pope's sovereignty that still broods over the Eternal City.

Squabbles inside the Axis

AXIS propaganda is continually harping upon supposed differences among the United Nations. It is a simple matter for them to imagine tension between the Russians, on the one hand, and the British and Americans on the other. From that it is a small step to spin stories of differences in British and American policy.

Giraud backed by the State Department in Washington, de Gaulle by the Foreign Office in London—that is their elucidation of French problems in Algiers. Yet, inside the group of nations that have associated themselves, willingly or unwillingly, with Germany serious rifts can be discovered. Hungary and Rumania are definitely opposed to one another. That is an old enmity. But now, Hungary and Slovakia are at loggerheads. The Swiss paper, *St. Galler Tageblatt*, for July 3rd, spoke of the recent International Press Congress that had been staged in Vienna to express European solidarity against Bolshevism. When one looks behind the scenes—the paper writes—

there is not much of this solidarity to be felt, especially in the South East. The Slovak Press is constantly engaged in polemics with the Hungarians, both within and without the Slovak frontiers . . . the papers demand special treatment for Slovakia. They even go so far as to recall Svatopluk's great Moravian Empire of 1,000 years ago, or claim that it was the Slovaks who checked the great Tartar wave. From this atmosphere there has grown up a regular irredentist feeling against Hungary. As in Rumania such polemics arise with the declared aim of taking Transylvania from Hungary, there is also the impression in Hungary that the old threads of the Little Entente are being re-spun, but this time under different auspices.

Slovak papers of early July speak of the ill-treatment of the considerable Slovak minority in Hungary. On the other side, the Hungarian press pungently reminds the Slovaks that they owe their present existence as a State to the new order in Europe which destroyed the Versailles and Trianon Treaties and has given to Hungary the right to its former possessions. These, of course, included Slovakia. Hungarian journals speak of Slovakia as a German protectorate, with which status they cannot reconcile this new spirit of irredentism, nurtured upon dreams and fictions and opposed not only to history but to the concrete situation of to-day. The Slovaks take particular umbrage at a religious ceremony held in the Hungarian capital when Budapest was consecrated to the Sacred Heart. Cardinal Serédi assisted at the ceremony. The prayer used spoke apparently of the restoration of Greater Hungary. The Slovak paper *Gardista* passes the following comment :

Great Hungary, surrounded by the Carpathians, is Nature's creation. As long as the Carpathians stand they will remain Hungary's frontiers. Thus, Slovakia is to disappear, the Slovak State is to be annihilated, we Slovaks, hundreds of thousands of Rumanians, Croats and Germans are to come under the domination of St. Stephen's crown. This is the spirit of the Hungarian prayer. We do not wish to get excited, but are convinced if blasphemy exists there is none greater than to wish to enslave free nations and to implore God's aid for this end.

The Slovaks indeed have their troubles. Here it is Hungary, else where it is Dr. Benes, that wants to absorb them into a larger State. The Nazis have problems, not alone in the countries they occupy, but also in the countries of their allies.

EAST AND WEST

THE PHOTIAN SCHISM: A RE-STATEMENT OF FACTS

[Editorial Note : Professor Dvornik, D.D., D.Litt., was Professor of Church History at the University of Prague prior to the war. He is now resident in this country and is continuing his historical researches. He has made a special study of the historical relations between the Eastern Churches and the Western Church, with particular reference to the period of the Photian Schism. He has recently completed a work on this difficult period which now awaits publication. In this article he examines the traditional Western account of the Schism and gives reasons why that account requires considerable correction, and even re-statement.]

WE owe it to the combined array of materialism and atheism against the fundamentals and the very idea of Christianity that we have suddenly and irresistibly grown conscious of the fact that the weakness of Christendom, if not of Christianity, lies in its divisions. The enemy's strategy has forced us to revise our own and to wonder why the flock of Christ cannot be as united as that of the Devil, and consequently, as strong. The ground would thus seem to be preparing itself for the idea of a *rapprochement* between the Roman Catholic Church and Eastern Christendom, represented by the so-called Orthodox Churches.

Leo XIII was the first Pope of the modern era to encourage Catholic scholars to study the evolution of the Eastern Church and to launch a crusade of prayers for the union of the Churches in fulfilment of the Lord's prayer that they all may be one (John xvii, 21) ; and all his successors have been true to Leo's message by lending encouragement to work and prayer for this great Christian design. Its most hopeful feature is that there are no properly dogmatic differences to keep western Roman Catholicity and the Eastern Orthodox Churches apart, the issue of the Primacy being a special problem in which dogmatic and historical considerations are inextricably mixed and only need unravelling to be cleared up. None the less, the path to a reunion between the two Christian worlds and the building of a united front is strewn with difficulties. The Eastern Church has carried on, divorced from western Christianity for many centuries, and in numberless things its evolution has diverged from western lines of growth. This alone would make it an arduous task for westerners to understand the eastern mentality and only a long study of the East can clear a way to better understanding. There are, moreover, some historical facts which are differently stated and interpreted in East and West and these differences are often more difficult to straighten out than dogmatic variances. These

problems should first be cleared up by specialists in Church History, and until this spade work is done, there is little hope of mutual understanding.

One of the crucial problems that has rendered the position almost hopeless and has for centuries exasperated historians and theologians in both East and West is the history of the patriarch Photius, the man regarded by the Eastern Church as its dominant figure and venerated as a saint. His name, unfortunately, has been associated with the rise of the first schism in the IXth century, when under Pope Nicholas I Photius played a prominent part in the first clash between the papacy and the East. The result is that the very same man who is venerated as a great saint by the Eastern Church has for centuries been regarded by Roman Catholics as the father of the great schism, the first redoubtable antagonist of the Primacy, whose memory has been held in dishonour by every Catholic scholar. This history of the patriarch still stands as the greatest stumbling block barring the way to reunion and not until it be removed can there be any hope of any real progress towards final reconciliation.

It is in this spirit that I have tried to study the history of those troubled days and revise all that has been said about Photius. Thanks to the progress of modern methods in historiography and the new historical science of Byzantinology, I have been able, I trust, to reach certain results that may clear the ground, and perhaps pave the way for ultimate pacification.

Before re-stating the facts and examining some of the problems bearing on the schism, it will be useful to recapitulate the facts and opinions in the traditional western version, to make clear the situation with which we are faced. This is how the story has been told.

After the death of patriarch Methodius in 846, the monk Ignatius, son of the emperor Michael, who had been deposed by the iconoclast Leo V, was elected to succeed to the throne of St. Sophia. The new incumbent, a model of holiness, soon captured the affections of the people. But his religious zeal ran foul of the intrigues of the empress's brother, Bardas, a man unscrupulous, greedy of power and notoriously immoral.

Bardas, who had been charged with the tuition of his nephew, the young emperor Michael III, corrupted the boy and trained him to become the perfect puppet monarch who, as soon as he should be released from the tutelage of his mother, Theodora, would let his Prime Minister govern the empire in his name. Ignatius, on learning that the astute statesman was living in sin with his daughter-in-law, publicly refused him communion, whereupon Bardas swore revenge and hurried forward his scheme to seize the reins of government. With the assistance of the young emperor, whom he helped to anticipate his majority, he first removed the empress Theodora from power, and to make sure of her disappearance from public life, relegated her

with her daughter to a convent. Ignatius protested against this arbitrary exercise of power and refused to impose the monastic habit on the ex-empress. Bardas, now the real head of the government, took action, deposed Ignatius and banished him to the Isle of Terebinth. When some of the clergy, won over by the powerful minister, urged Ignatius to resign, the prelate indignantly refused. It was then that Bardas nominated a new patriarch in the person of a layman, the President of the Imperial Chancellery, Photius. His elevation, so it is alleged, was irregular and his consecration uncanonical, as all the orders were conferred on him in record time, in one day perhaps, at most within a week, by the Bishop of Syracuse, Gregory Asbestas, the very man whom Ignatius had deposed and anathematized. The majority of the clergy, however, remained loyal to Ignatius.

As a counter move, the partisans of the fallen patriarch met at Constantinople in the church of St. Irene and deposed Photius. In retaliation, the new patriarch, an ambitious man, who had been coveting ecclesiastical honours for years, excommunicated Ignatius and all his followers and let loose a violent persecution to break their resistance and bring them to heel. Ignatius was personally ill-treated and the monks of Mount Olympius, who had declared for remaining under his obedience, were expelled from their cells, which were burned to the ground.

When he had dealt with the opposition, Photius sent a letter to Rome asking the Pope for recognition as the legitimate patriarch and the emperor and Bardas supported the request on the ground that Ignatius had resigned. At the same time, they petitioned the Pope to send legates to Constantinople for the summoning of a council for the purpose of condemning the iconoclasts a second time. This was only a pretext ; the real intention was to stage a solemn condemnation of Ignatius. This purpose, it is alleged, was attained : the legates, on reaching Constantinople, were won over to the Photianist party by a cunning combination of threats and presents and, in defiance of the Pope's orders, they judged and condemned Ignatius. Browbeaten by Photius and his supporters, the unfortunate patriarch appealed to the Pope in the course of the council, and the very same day, Theognostus, one of his loyal partisans, disguised as a layman, escaped from Constantinople and transmitted the appeal to Rome. Pope Nicholas, on receiving this information of Photius's intrigues, first disowned the legates' action, refused to acknowledge Photius as the legitimate patriarch, then reinstated Ignatius and excommunicated his rival. Photius then instigated the emperor to send to the Pope an insulting letter, to which Nicholas replied in firm and dignified terms, confirming the condemnation of Photius, but declaring his readiness to re-examine the case in Rome and requesting the two parties to send their representatives.

To this communication, Photius retorted with a violent campaign

against the Roman primacy and finally, in 867, summoned all the eastern patriarchs to a council, where he condemned and excommunicated Pope Nicholas I, trying meanwhile to enlist the good will of Louis II.

But all these eastern intrigues were happily foiled by Providence, for before the Acts of this council of Photius could find their way to the west, the emperor Michael III was assassinated by his friend Basil, who proclaimed himself Basileus and immediately after his enthronement, took the Roman side, deposed Photius and replaced the Patriarch Ignatius on his throne. He then sent an embassy to Rome requesting the convocation of a council for the definite settlement of this trouble. Hadrian II, successor to Nicholas I, received the imperial envoys with consideration, and a council held in Constantinople in 869-870 solemnly condemned Photius and confirmed the final rehabilitation of Ignatius. Thus ended the first schism provoked by the arrogance of Photius.

Such is the story of the first schism which has held the field in our history books to this day. Needless to say, it calls for correction at many points and even for re-statement. Before sifting the facts we must try and place them in their natural and historical setting by recalling the situation in Byzantium at the advent of Ignatius.

From time immemorial, perhaps ever since the transfer of Imperial Rome to the banks of the Bosphorus, there had existed in Byzantium a deep-seated incompatibility and open rivalry between two main tendencies, the one Moderate or Liberal, the other, Conservative and reactionary, called respectively the Greens and the Blues. These were originally two semi-sporting, semi-political factions of the Hippodrome, the successor of the Roman Circus. The clash between the two that ravaged the empire until the VIIIth century gradually shifted from the battlefield to the more cultured domain of politics, religion and civic affairs. The same tendencies assumed different names in the struggle between the Iconoclasts and the Iconodules, and when this trouble was settled and orthodoxy restored, in the conflict between the Moderates, partisans of the *Oekonomia*, and the Reactionaries or the Extremists.

At the death of Methodius, the Byzantine Church happened to be rent by a schism, when the Studites, who formed the extreme right wing of this Die-hard party, were excommunicated by the patriarch. A careful reading of some sources bearing on this quarrel reveals a state of affairs in the Byzantine Church that caused the gravest misgivings.

At the time under discussion, the Moderates and the Extremists were making a bid for supremacy in religious affairs and the difficulties in the political sphere did not ease matters. Bardas, the empress's brother, resenting his removal from the government to make room for the eunuch Theoctistus, secretly worked to undermine the influence

of the new Prime Minister. His quick-witted versatility soon enabled him to build up a reputation among the Byzantine intellectuals, who invariably supplied the Moderate party with the bulk of its recruits, and gradually to supersede Theoctistus's influence among them. The eunuch saw what was brewing and kept his eyes on this dangerous rival.

Directly Bardas had found favour with the Moderates, Theoctistus had no choice but to shift his patronage to the Extremists, the party in favour with Theodora, whom they revered as a second Irene, the restorer of image worship, and who was watching the political changes at the imperial palace with increasing interest.

At the death of Methodius, the re-shuffling of forces was practically completed and the two parties set about to secure the patriarchal throne for their respective candidates; the archbishop of Syracuse, Gregory Asbestos, leader of the intellectual ecclesiastical wing of the Moderates, displayed exceptional activity.

Under the circumstances, the empress and Theoctistus considered it urgent to adopt an energetic and clear-cut attitude, for fear the existing schism should endanger the future of the Church and, dispensing with the usual formalities, Theodora, instead of summoning a local synod for the election to the new patriarch, coolly appointed the monk Ignatius as successor to Methodius.

The procedure was arbitrary and uncanonical, but the position of the Byzantine Church seemed to justify it; it moreover strengthened the sympathies of the empress and Theoctistus for the Extremists but as Ignatius had not been directly involved in the quarrel between Methodius and the Studites, the whole clergy acquiesced.

As ill luck would have it, Ignatius on the very day of his consecration, made a tactical mistake. Giving ear too readily to accusations levelled by the Extremists at the leader of the Moderates, Gregory Asbestos, Ignatius forbade him to attend his consecration unless he first exculpated himself. Praiseworthy as was his religious zeal, his action was a blunder, for it wrecked every possibility of his arbitrating between the ecclesiastics who belonged to the two parties: Ignatius was henceforth branded as an Extremist.

The Moderates, finding themselves ousted from the direction of ecclesiastical affairs, threw all their energies into an attempt to seize the direction of civil politics; their leader, Bardas, opened hostilities against the Prime Minister Theoctistus. The struggle ended in true oriental style; Theoctistus was murdered by Bardas with the complicity of young Michael. For this murderous deed, there could be no excuse save that of the certainty of being killed, unless he took the first step and suppressed Theoctistus. Michael's complicity was in part due to the memory of the grim scene enacted at Byzantium in the reign of empress Irene, when Constantine VI was dethroned and blinded by his own mother, Irene, and her Prime Minister Staurakios. It

was a dangerous precedent for young emperors who succeeded their mothers.

His majority attained, Michael entered upon his function as *autocrat*, whilst his mother, Theodora, chafing under the treatment accorded her and yielding to the promptings of the Extremists, was busy plotting against Bardas. But the new government, with the support of the Moderates, was on its guard : the plot was unearthed and Theodora requested to embrace religious life and thereby remove the rallying point of her partisans.

With this conflict for the exercise of civil power in full swing, the ecclesiastical wing of the Moderate party was not idling away its precious time. Ignatius's reactionary tendencies grew more pronounced as time went on and though his zeal for sacred things was sincere, it was sometimes not equally discreet. The Studites and the extremist monks were solemnly taken back into the bosom of the Church and repaid the compliment by committing the patriarch to their own methods ; the Moderates, seeing him jettison the policy of his predecessor Methodius, were loud in their criticisms and even went so far as to parody the religious services over which Ignatius presided—an amusement which particularly appealed to Michael.

Gregory Asbestos, naturally the most refractory member of the opposition, was promptly deposed by Ignatius together with his most prominent friends : he appealed to Rome and received a considerate hearing, but his case dragged on and was not yet settled when Ignatius had ceased to exercise his patriarchal functions. To make a long tale short, the Extremists had taken complete control of Church matters.

The changes operated in the imperial palace did not of course please the Extremists, who did their best to discredit the new government in the eyes of the public, spreading rumours to the effect that Bardas was living in sin with his daughter-in-law. There was not an atom of truth in the gossip. Bardas, who had lost his son, transferred his paternal affection to his deceased son's wife, who stood in need of support and consolation ; but Ignatius, with a zeal that sometimes threw him off his balance, listened to the libellous accusation and publicly shamed Bardas by refusing him communion.

The insult openly challenged the government's prestige ; and when Ignatius, in his loyalty to Theodora, refused to bless her veil, the government read into the refusal a confession of complicity with the enemies of the regime. Another fracas followed and one of its instigators, a monk, having been executed, Ignatius committed the indiscretion of speaking in his defence.

This time, the government lost patience and decided then and there to intern him in the Isle of Terebinth.

Note that the interned patriarch had not been deposed ; but the clergy, anxious to forestall a conflict between the ecclesiastical and

civil authorities, urged him to abdicate. Now, it has been constantly repeated from the principal available sources, chiefly Nicetas, the so-called biographer of Ignatius, that he refused their request. Be it stated at once that the assertion is untrue. A minute analysis of the accounts originating from reactionary circles, their collation with some declarations preserved in the Acts of the VIIIth Council and certain little known sources, for instance, the Life of St. Euthymius, have driven us to the conclusion that Ignatius did in fact abdicate, a noble act that did him credit.

The patriarchal throne being vacant, the government seemingly meant to follow Theodora's procedure by appointing the patriarch, but as the higher clergy insisted on the canonical rules being observed, the election was proceeded with, Asbestos being the leader of the Moderate party, and the metropolitan of Smyrna, of the Extremists.

First, the case of Asbestos and his friends was settled, the parties concerned being reinstated. Then, as the Fathers could not come to an agreement on the choice of a successor, each party obstinately clinging to its candidate, it was decided to elect a patriarch from among the laity and to choose the President of the Imperial Chancellery, Photius. The election was thus the result of a compromise. All the bishops, without exception, even those who later were to turn against him, acknowledged their new pastor. He was consecrated by Asbestos, who had just recovered the exercise of his episcopal powers, but as there could be no question of keeping the canonical intervals between the different degrees of the priestly orders, Photius was rushed through them in the space of six days.

The entente lasted a month, two months at most, when the Extremists grew restless, rose against Photius and on the pretext that he did not observe the stipulations of the compromise arrived at before his election, declared him deposed and Ignatius reinstated as their legitimate patriarch.

The motives for this new rupture were apparently to a great extent of a political nature and of a piece with the old party wrangles, and as the government was quite aware of this, it made short shrift of the agitators. It should be added that Photius protested to Bardas against the excesses of some State functionaries, and he himself waited full six months before taking ecclesiastical action.

The incident seemed closed, when Photius made contact with the Pope. He did not ask the Pope to confirm his election, since the Byzantines considered the election of patriarchs and bishops to be their own business and no concern of Rome, though Nicholas I had in this respect a different idea. In common with the whole of the Middle Ages, he sincerely believed that the Pseudo-Isidoran decretals were completely authentic. Nicholas therefore adjudicated between Ignatius and Photius in the light of the principles that had guided

him in the examination of previous issues of the same nature that had cropped up in the Western Church.

He explained his point of view to the emperor in firm and unmistakable terms : as he had not been consulted in the incident, he refused to acknowledge Photius before his legates should have made enquiries on the spot and examined all the circumstances in collaboration with the Fathers of the Council about to be summoned.

The Pope's decision gave the Byzantines an unpleasant surprise. They had looked on the incident as definitely closed and had asked the Pope for the despatch of legates to settle the iconoclastic issue once for all, not to go over the case of Ignatius and Photius once again. As the legates insisted, the emperor forced on them the following dilemma : either agree to a council that would reconsider Ignatius's case and give its verdict in Constantinople in the Pope's name, or have no council at all.

Bishops Zachary of Anagni and Radoald of Porto, the Pope's delegates, were excellent canonists and they saw that the alternative offered by the emperor provided a new opportunity for the papacy : it was in fact the first time that the representatives of the Holy See were asked to judge a patriarch of Constantinople on a disciplinary issue. So, they took it for granted that they were justified in disregarding the Pope's orders—he had reserved the final judgment to himself—the stake proving worth the risk.

So the Council met in the beginning of 861 in Constantinople. The Greek Acts have been destroyed, but we possess an extract from their Latin translation preserved in the canonical work of Cardinal Deusdedit, dating from the end of the XIth century and absolutely authentic, as I have shown in my book on the Photian schism at present awaiting publication.

Strange to say, this highly interesting document has never been studied seriously : its tenour so flagrantly contradicts whatever has been repeated about Photius since the XVIIth century, that no one has dared to subject it to careful analysis. And yet, no other Greek document of the IXth century refers to the Roman See with greater reverence. The legates actually claimed for Rome the right, in virtue of a decree of the Council of Sardica, to revise in the first instance all cases of the same nature, and the Fathers of the Council exclaimed : "We are not questioning that right. The whole Church rejoices at it." The importance of this declaration, though it escaped the attention of historians, should be obvious, it being the Eastern Church's first official recognition of the Holy See's *jus appellationis*. According to the Acts, Ignatius was tried on his procedure in the case of Gregory Asbestas and on his uncanonical election. The ex-patriarch, who at first denied the competence of his judges—"Ego non appellavi Romam nec appello. Quid vultis iudicare," he had said—then yielded to persuasion and accepted the sentence.

To this day, the statement by Nicetas of Paphlagonia in Asia Minor, Ignatius's biographer, has generally been credited and it has been assumed that Ignatius appealed to the Pope's judgment in Rome ; but the Acts of the Council of 861—a document beyond dispute—clearly have it that Ignatius had not appealed to Rome before the Council met that condemned him. The same biographer then pretends that Ignatius appealed after his condemnation, but even this allegation is not correct. Another passage of the biographer's account, the Acts of the Council and some of Ignatius's statements, interpreted in the light of recent researches, clearly prove that the condemned patriarch never appealed to Rome at all.

The Pope, informed of what had happened in Byzantium, approved, contrary to what has been alleged and in view of the important results obtained, his legates' attitude. It is true that Nicholas did not get complete satisfaction and that ancient Illyricum, i.e., Macedonia and Greece, which had been severed from the jurisdiction of the Holy See by the iconoclast emperors, was not restored to him as requested. But he tried to resume negotiations on this point and seized the occasion of a letter to Michael to express his surprise at the liberties the Greeks and the legates had taken with the instructions he had issued with regard to Ignatius's trial and asked for the return of Illyricum as "compensation." But neither the emperor nor the patriarch had the slightest intention of handing over this Greek territory : hence the Pope's change of attitude, when he readily listened to the proposals of the Ignatian party represented in Rome by the monk Theognostus. This individual, falsely representing himself to be Ignatius's envoy, handed to Nicholas a written memorial, which the Pope accepted as though it had come from the ex-patriarch. His statements and those of other monks belonging to reactionary circles, also refugees in Rome, were cleverly calculated to raise hopes for the recovery of Illyricum, if only Ignatius and his partisans were helped to come into their own. Thus it happened that two years after Ignatius's condemnation by the Council of 861, Nicholas I excommunicated Photius and reinstated Ignatius.

Exasperated by this change of attitude, the emperor Michael replied in a somewhat forcible letter that the Pope had no business to meddle with Ignatius's case, it being the sole concern of the Byzantine Church ; to which the Pope replied in a letter that has remained famous and has been quoted in all the canonical collections of the Middle Ages. But he left an avenue open to an arrangement satisfactory to both Michael and Photius, an arrangement which Bulgarian developments prevented materialising. The Bulgarian khagan Boris, who had been baptised by Photius and whose sway extended to a large portion of Macedonia, i.e., ancient Illyricum, severed his connection with Byzantium and applied to Rome for Latin priests. Thereupon, the Pope grew more adamant than ever

on the issue of Illyricum, and not until then did Photius have him condemned by an eastern council.

It is generally held that this condemnation meant a denial of the Roman Primacy, but the opinion does not hold water. Photius, as far as we know, always agreed to the privileged position of the See of Rome as the whole Church had agreed to his day, and the writings against the Primacy attributed to him were not his, but were fathered on him only in the XIVth century, when the quarrel between Rome and Byzantium took a tragic turn. Photius only meant to arraign the person of Nicholas and judge some of his actions. None the less it must be admitted that his unfortunate move was pregnant with consequences and was to a great extent responsible for the ill repute that clung to his name throughout the Middle Ages down to our own days. It should also be added that his notorious encyclical to the Orientals, which did such damage and blamed the Latins for sundry abuses, was not aimed at the Roman Church, but only at the Latin missionaries operating in Bulgaria.

Nicholas died before hearing of his condemnation by the Orientals. It is well known that his policy was not without its opposition in the West, for the *Liber Pontificalis* and a letter from the chancellor Anastasius to Ado of Vienne inform us of the existence in Rome of a party anxious to reverse a policy that was too rigid where Orientals were concerned, and which brought pressure to bear on Hadrian II for a change. The party's activity, so we are told, gave Theognostus, the real culprit in the mismanagement of the Ignatian case, many a sleepless night.

In the meantime, and before even Byzantium heard of Nicholas's death, Michael III was assassinated and replaced by his murderer, Basil I, who had taken the precaution of suppressing Bardas as well. Another palace revolution broke out with the connivance of the Extremists, whose policy the new emperor was naturally expected to adopt, with the result that Photius was deposed and Ignatius reinstated.

Historians have been extremely hard on Michael III, but the recent discoveries of Professor H. Grégoire, of Brussels, have amply demonstrated that Michael was after all not the merry gambler and drunkard he has been assumed to be. He loved good cheer, no doubt, and professed no insuperable objection to a good bottle: may be, he occasionally abused it; but jovial as he was and fond of somewhat crude amusements, he was a good king for all that, fond of sport, brave, a good general, beloved of his people. Of course, the *de facto* ruler during his reign was his uncle Bardas. Nor was Michael such a bad son as tradition would have it. It is true, he confined his mother to a convent, but he must have been subsequently reconciled with her, for Theodora resumed her place of honour at the imperial palace. The very day he was assassinated, he was due to attend a State banquet

offered to him by his mother ; and when poor Theodora learned of her only son's tragic end, she hastened to his blood-stained body and "bathed it in her tears."

When the news of Photius's fall reached Rome, the Nicholaites triumphed and it was this unexpected turn of events that gave Nicholas's ideas on the supremacy of the papacy the hold it kept on the West throughout the Middle Ages. To silence the Nicholaites' criticisms, Hadrian II hastened to give evidence of his zeal and readily met the emperor's request to send his legates to the new council and to condemn Photius before giving him a hearing. Basil vainly tried to wring some concessions from the legates ; but they were adamant and peremptorily summoned the bishops to sign the condemnation.

So, the Council did not restore peace in Byzantium after all ; it only rallied a small number of participants, and the Photian clergy, with few exceptions, remained loyal to the ex-patriarch, while Basil, wounded by the legates' high-handedness, gradually drew nearer to the Moderates, who, at Photius's suggestion, maintained a dignified and loyal attitude to the emperor.

This was a clever move, for it proved that power could be seized by degrees without any revolutionary blood-letting. However, the Pope, in his anxiety to remain the faithful follower of his predecessor's policy, rejected all demands coming from the emperor and the patriarch for a mitigation of the sentence against the Photian clergy. The position in Byzantium became impossible. Ignatius was unable to find priests and to provide for the needs of the faithful : where the Photianists were in the majority, they carried on with their functions.

To allay public feelings and curry favour with the Moderates, Basil recalled Photius from exile and placed him in charge of the education of his children and probably at the head of the University. This was a bitter pill for the Extremists to swallow and to make it worse, Ignatius and Photius, contrary to what has been believed so far, became friends. I have found evidence of this reconciliation in some documents coming from Ignatian circles and misread to this day, as well as in an unknown document discovered by my predecessors, namely a funeral oration on Basil given by his son, Leo the Wise. It shows that Ignatius intended solemnly to announce the rehabilitation of Photius and his party in the course of a great council, to which the emperor had requested the Pope to send his legates ; but before the representatives of the Holy See had time to reach their destination, Ignatius died.

The picture which my researches have enabled me to draw of Ignatius is therefore substantially different from the caricature we have been used to so far. Ignatius was not the obstinate and implacable old man of popular fancy, but a prelate who knew when and how to sacrifice his own interests to those of the Church he governed. It was not because he was old and feeble that he relaxed his firmness with

Photius : it was his magnanimity that dictated a line of action worthy of an ascetic, not quite at home in worldly affairs, but able to confess his weakness and to stretch out a friendly hand to an opponent.

Ignatius's attitude on the Bulgarian issue also won him the esteem of every Byzantine patriot. In the face of Roman protests, he readily opened the Byzantine Church to Boris of Bulgaria, when Boris broke loose from the jurisdiction of Rome, and set about re-organizing the whole clergy in that country, the Photianist clergy apparently seconding him in this patriotic work with the approval of their leader. This naturally provoked resentment in Rome and Ignatius may have had his death to thank for a narrow escape from excommunication.

Ignatius gone, Photius, in virtue of the agreement between the emperor and the deceased patriarch, re-occupied the patriarchal throne, when Pope John VIII saw his opportunity to liquidate the whole quarrel and turn it to profit, declaring in his instructions to his legates and his letters to Photius, Basil and the Council, that he was willing to acknowledge Photius as the legitimate patriarch, on condition that he should apologise to the Council for his past behaviour and renounce all claims on Bulgaria.

The legates, on realising the position, at once saw the utter impossibility of carrying out the first condition laid down in complete ignorance of the conditions in Byzantium. Photius could not agree to the Pope's point of view without *ipso facto* approving the Extremists' methods and policy, and the legates' mission was doomed to failure, if they insisted on this condition being implemented.

Circumstances also made it imperative that the pontifical letters should be modified before being read to the Council, and they were doctored to that effect, all references to pardon being deleted, and a few compliments addressed to Photius being added. Historians, who have analysed the two versions, have overlooked the fact that Photius left untouched nearly every word written by the Pope on the Primacy of the Holy See, which proves that the alterations were not made in a spirit of hostility to Rome.

Surprise has been expressed that the two last sessions of the Council should have followed a peculiar procedure and that the emperor presided over the last session but one, the inference being drawn that the minutes of the meetings were tampered with by Photius, because the Symbol of Faith had been recited without the *Filioque*. But there is an easy explanation. Emperor Basil had in the autumn of 879 lost his eldest son Alexander, and as all preparations had been made and the council could not be postponed for the court's mourning, Photius was commissioned by Basil to perform the function usually reserved to the sovereign of presiding at the sessions and leading the debates ; and since the emperor had to be present at one session at least, the delegates met at the imperial palace for the session at which

the Symbol of Faith had to be proclaimed. But this session was held over till the closing of the court's six months of mourning.

This council confirmed the rehabilitation of Photius and his clergy and declared the Council of 869-870 to be null and void—(its Acts in the original Greek have since disappeared, but we have Anastasius's Latin translation and one Greek extract)—and the ultra-extremists who refused to submit to Photius, were excommunicated.

Until 1933, it was universally assumed that Pope John VIII refused his sanction to the Acts of the Council of 879-880 which reinstated Photius, that he firmly protested against the falsification of his letters to Photius, completely repudiated his legates' action, as Nicholas I had done before him, and sent Deacon Marinus, the future Pope, to make an inquiry on the spot. Marinus, so it was alleged, was imprisoned by the emperor, and the Pope, on discovering the true state of affairs and learning that the vast majority of the clergy had refused to acknowledge Photius, again solemnly excommunicated him. Thus there would have arisen a second schism of Photius, more disastrous than the first, which would last till the second fall of Photius. All the successors of John VIII—Hadrian III, Marinus, St. Stephen VI, Formosus—would have repeated the excommunication inflicted by John.

This gratuitous assumption, which for centuries has been regarded as the only true one, must be reversed to-day and completely rejected. What happened is that historians were simply mystified by some passages in anti-Photianist writings. It is true that Pope John VIII found it strange, and said so, that the conditions he had laid down should have been disregarded and that people should have taken it upon themselves to tamper with his letters; but what is clearly deducible from patriarch Photius's writings and the Pope's letter, so far misinterpreted, is that John eventually accepted the explanations offered by Photius and the legates, ratified the Acts of the Council, including the canon which annulled the so-called VIIIth œcumenical council, and that Photius was re-excommunicated neither by him nor by any of his successors. Henceforth, the two Churches were to live on excellent terms, since Marinus's "imprisonment" dates in reality from the time of the VIIIth Council of 870; when Marinus represented the Pope in Byzantium somewhat too literally.

Note also that Basil sent to John VIII substantial military assistance against the Arabs, that the two Churches made mutual concessions in Southern Italy, at that time a fief of the Byzantine empire, and that Byzantium eventually did cede Bulgaria to Rome on the one condition that the Greek clergy who were already working there should be allowed to continue their ministry: so, it was not Photius, but Boris who was responsible for Rome's failure in that country.

When Photius was called upon in 886 to relinquish his see, Pope Stephen V took his defence and it was not until emperor Leo VI

had sent him a copy of the abdication duly signed by Photius that Stephen finally consented to acknowledge the emperor's brother as the legitimate patriarch.

There was a schism in Byzantium, but only within the Greek Church, when a small minority of the clergy set up "a little Church" on the lines of the Scots "Wee Frees," and they remained obdurate even after Photius's fall and refused to enter into communion with his successor, the emperor's brother, because the latter had been ordained a deacon by Photius. This "Little Church" vainly tried to coax Rome to its point of view, but Rome lent no ear to its arguments and continued to remain in communion with Photius and his successors. This domestic schism was not healed till the end of the IXth century, about 898, under Patriarch Cauleas, and that not by a special synod, as has been the general opinion so far, but by an exchange of correspondence between the leader of the Little Church, Stylian of Neocesarea, and Pope John IX. As to Photius's second dethronement, it was due to another bloodless revolution under Leo VI, who inaugurated his reign with the usual flirtation with the party of the Extremists; but exasperated by the radicalism of their extreme right, he soon followed his father's example and transferred his patronage to the Moderates.

All that I have attempted here is a re-statement of the facts which, considering the number and complexity of the problems it raises, might be considered as superficial. How was it possible, for instance, for the truth to remain travestied so long? Who was responsible for the birth of the Photian legend? Who gave it that monopoly in the field of history? How is it that the Western Church, unlike the Eastern Church, still considers the council of 869-870 as the VIIIth Œcumenical Council. When did this confusion arise? Why does the Orthodox Church continue to look up to Photius as its champion against the Roman Primacy—a thing he never was? So many weighty problems that keep the two Churches apart, problems that demand some solution! I hope to have shed some fresh light upon these problems and their solution in my work on the Photian Schism, which at present is awaiting publication.

F. DVORNIK.

EDITORIAL NOTE

All contributions submitted to the Editor must be typed and be accompanied by a sufficiently large stamped addressed envelope—stamps (or Post Office coupons from abroad) alone will not suffice. Articles so submitted should be concerned with matters of general interest, and be the fruit of expert knowledge or original research. They should not ordinarily exceed 3,000 words, and must be intended for exclusive publication in the "Month," if accepted.

Literary Communications, Exchanges, and Books for Review should be addressed to The Editor of "The Month," 114 Mount Street, London, W.1, and not to the Publishers: Business Communications to The Manager, Manresa Press, Roehampton, London, S.W.15.

THE MYSTICAL BODY

THE doctrine of the Mystical Incorporation of the Christian with Christ may well be considered as the foundation and summing up of the entire Christian system both in theory and in practice. In it are involved the dogmas of the divinity and humanity of Christ and our own adoptive sonship of God : of our elevation to the supernatural plane of life which we call the state of sanctifying or habitual grace : of the possibility of meriting before God by our good works and of recovery from actual sin by repentance : of the efficacy of prayer and of the sacraments : of the final resurrection of our bodies—in a word, the whole complexus of revealed truths, and all the privileges, promises, and sanctions by which, or for the sake of which, the Christian life is ordered. It is the more remarkable therefore, that in the Catechism, which is supposed to offer an authorised epitome of the Catholic Faith, there is no mention nor hint of this doctrine which nevertheless has been continuously taught by the Church and which one may truly say furnishes, under different aspects, practically the whole theme of the preaching of St. Paul. It is true that “incorporation” is a long word, and that there are some who when they encounter the word “mystical” become uneasy and even rather hostile. Yet it is a simple matter to explain the practical meaning of the former word to any child, and as simple to explain that here the term “mystical” means only that while we can be certain of the reality of the fact, the “how” of it is hidden from us now. One might point out, by way of simile, that the facts of God’s plane of existence are “mystical” to us much as the facts of *our* plane (reading, writing, and arithmetic for example) are “mystical” to an animal.

Experience has often proved, however, that there is no great difficulty in conveying substantially the implications of this doctrine to even the least sophisticated mind.

It is, of course, true that the Church has always taught (at any rate implicitly) the doctrine of our mystical incorporation, since it is inherent in all her faith and teaching about Christ. But it is also true that at different periods of her history she has, for various sound reasons, laid special emphasis upon this or that specific doctrine (almost, it might seem, to the temporary disregard of others)—as for instance on the Divinity of Christ in the 4th century, on the Real Presence in the 9th, or on the necessity and efficacy of good works in the 16th—and that in our own day she is paying particular attention to the doctrine at present in question, seems to be insinuated by the noticeable increase of literature upon the subject which has been so evident of late years.

What, then, is meant by the doctrine of the Mystical Incorporation with Christ is that by the Sacrament of Baptism there is effected between Christ and the baptised person a true, if ineffable, union (what Mother Julian of Norwich calls "a ghostly one-ing") in virtue of which the subject of the Sacrament, without losing his own identity, takes upon himself in the eyes of God identity with Christ Himself. "I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me," says St. Paul : meaning that I am supernaturally alive or not alive, in God's eyes, according as looking at me He sees, or does not see, me as Christ and Christ as me.

We are here already confronted with a mystical fact : a fact, namely, which we can *state*, though we cannot express it, in words ; and of which we can see, though we cannot understand, the truth. It appears on the surface to entail an inextricable confusion of ideas ; for how can two individuals be so involved one with the other as to form a new individual which is each of them and both of them yet without being a mixture or composition of either with the other ? It does not seem to make sense. But neither do a great many other mystical facts seem to make sense—as, for instance, that all God's attributes are identical one with another, His eternity with His wisdom, His omnipotence with His love, or that with Him there is no past and no future, and, indeed, in our meaning of the word, no present : in any case if there be what looks like contradiction, at least it is not contradiction in *terms*, for here the two terms are the finite and the infinite, the human and the divine, two orders of being absolutely and essentially different not in degree but in kind, so that there can no more be a clash or contradiction between them than there can be between, say, the shape of a thing and its colour. Bearing this in mind, we need have no difficulty in accepting that what St. Paul means is that the baptised person does indeed truly become Christ yet without ceasing to be himself, and that Christ does indeed truly become him yet without ceasing to be *Himself*, and that before God there now stands a new man, an "I-Christ" or a "Christ-I," a member of that new creation, that second race, of which Christ is the new Head, the second Adam.

The idea is well expressed in the English word "christened" for "baptised" : by baptism we are "*Christ-ened*," made Christ, as a thing is blackened or whitened, made black or white. By this work of grace achieved in our souls, there arises what St. Paul speaks of as "the new man." "Christ," he says to the Ephesians, "makes the two in Himself into one new man" : and to the Corinthians he uses the expressions "a new creature," "a new paste." A useful analogy (which of course must not be pressed too far) may be drawn between this doctrine and that of the Hypostatic Union. This latter teaches that in Christ there are two entirely distinct natures, the human and the divine, but only one person—one "I," one "He." Similarly, in the baptised, "*Christ-ened*" man there are his own simply human

self and the divine-human self of Christ, and the two, fused as it were by Baptism, present before God a new Christ-person, supernaturally alive only because he is such : "I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me."

Parallel, again, to the theandric nature of Christ's actions there is now a new Christ-value in all the actions of the Christian living in the state of grace. Luther taught in his doctrine of justification by faith alone that man is so utterly corrupt that it is absolutely impossible for him to perform any action which shall be meritorious before God. But if he make a genuine act of faith in Christ as his Redeemer (i.e., as one who has atoned by His sacrifice for all human sin past, present, and to come) Christ then stands between him and God, who thus views all his actions *through* Christ and sees them as good because He sees them "Christ-coloured," so to speak, as objects of different colours when seen through a pane of red glass are seen red-coloured. He is indeed *Christ-ened*, but only on the surface : his own actions, as such are still in themselves evil, and are acceptable to God only in virtue of this extrinsic imputation of the merits of Christ.

We, on the contrary, maintain that our just acts are truly our own just acts, and that they are so because through our incorporation with Christ they are His too—not separately from, nor externally added to, but really one, with ours as we now are one with Him. But this Christ-ening of the baptised is not a thing automatically or mechanically fulfilled in us. St. John, in the first chapter of his Gospel, says, "He came unto His own and His own received Him not : but as many as received Him, to them He gave power to be made the sons of God" : i.e., that by the receiving of Christ through faith in Him and through the operation of that sacrament which He has appointed as the means of our association with Him, there is inserted into our souls what we shall be following St. Paul's thought in calling a "germ" or a "graft" of the Christ-life, and with it the power of tending that life, of developing and bringing it to maturity until we attain to what he calls in Ephesians "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Addressing the Galatians he calls them "my little children of whom I am in labour again until Christ be formed in you" : with that boldness, that almost recklessness of metaphor which is so characteristic of him, he here presents himself as a mother bringing to the birth, in each of his converts, the new man, the Christ-child, who has been conceived in their souls by the sacrament of baptism which they have received. This is quite in line with Our Lord's own warning to Nicodemus, that "except a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven" ; for it is only through the adoptive sonship of God which is effected in us by this mystical union with His only-begotten Son, that we are fitted for elevation to that life of communion with God on His own plane which we call heaven : by it, says St. Augustine, we are admitted into the very family of the Blessed Trinity.

But our mystical incorporation with Christ is not a static but a dynamic condition. Or rather, it is static in so far as it stamps upon us an ineradicable character, but dynamic in that it demands co-operative action on our part for its full realisation: for our union with Christ is not so much a position as a process—not so much the oneness of two things *clamped* together as of two things *acting* together; rather like two notes making harmony one with the other. In other words, an organic change is wrought in our souls by the Sacrament of incorporation with Christ which we call Baptism, a *potency* for the actual Christ-life which we can derive from nowhere else, and it is our part to release, to draw upon this potency or else it will remain sterile and we shall be spiritually *un-alive* in God's eyes. It is comparable to a graft in a fruit-tree (St. Paul indeed uses the very simile) whose invigorating and rejuvenating effect depends upon the active reception (so to call it) which the tree affords it. So long as the soul is in a state of grace the "graft" is active, literally "I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me": I am pleasing in God's eyes, alive, that is, in the supernatural sense, because my life is mine, now not mine but Christ's life in me. But no one, so long as he is in possession of his faculties, can be just negatively and passively good. All conscious, responsible life in an intellectual being is made up of a chain of choices, that is, of activities; so that the maintenance and growth of my aliveness in God's eyes will depend upon my positive action, upon my free thoughts and words and deeds.

How am I to be assured that these will favour the diffusion and strengthening in me, as my own, of that Christ-life which is the only true life? St. Paul gives us the prescription in his Epistle to the Romans. "Put ye on," he says, "put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ." I think he means the metaphor to be applied literally, however extravagant that may at first sight appear, and that one should ask oneself what would result if one could actually fit Christ physically over oneself, really clothe oneself in Him? It would be that thereafter one would see through Christ's eyes—that things and persons and happenings would look to us as they looked to Him: that one would think His thoughts, like or dislike what He liked or disliked, use one's hands and feet and tongue as He did: and with the Gospel open before us, it should not be difficult to satisfy oneself at any juncture of life as to the right Christly attitude or estimate or mode of action to be adopted.

To look through Christ's eyes is to see the world as first and foremost the kingdom of God, the field for the accomplishment of His will on earth as it is in heaven, and all things else as secondary to that. If we cannot say with any assurance what sort of thoughts were in His mind when, for instance, He was silent or alone, at least we can be quite sure of what sort of thoughts were *not* there—nothing narrow or hard or self-regarding or second-rate, nothing but what was large and generous and brave. "He went about doing good," says St.

Peter ; and His very enemies acknowledged, as St. John tells us, that "never man spake as this man speaks."

The development of the Christ-graft in us is, of course, the task of the Holy Ghost of Whom Our Lord said that when He came (as He has come to all who are baptised) He would bring to our minds all things whatsoever He had said to us. But the Holy Ghost will not violate our liberty : He waits upon our good-will : but when that is given, He lends to it a force immeasurably above what it possesses of itself and through it brings into ever more active reality the Christhood that we received at our baptism.

In the eyes of God the Father there is, for all time, but one Just Man, His beloved Son in whom He is well-pleased, whom Pilate, prophesying like Caiaphas without knowing what he did, exhibited to the world as *The Man—Ecce Homo*—with whom the whole of those who to the end of time are baptised in His name are collectively and individually one ; and it is because of this identification that in God's eyes we are justified and are well-pleasing to Him. And this reaches into all the details of our spiritual life—I live, I love, I pray, I suffer, now not I but Christ in and as me, and I in and as Him.

If the question arises, What happens to the Christian, the new Christ-man, when he falls into sin ? Can he still, in that condition say of himself "I live, now not I but Christ liveth in me," or is the mystical incorporation with Christ from which he derives his right to say this at all suspended, as it were, until he repents of his sin ?, the answer would appear to be that in some way which is involved in the unfathomable mystery of the Incarnation, Christ is indeed dragged into his sin not, of course, in the sense of personal participation in it, but much as in the same mysterious way, in His Passion, He and not merely His body, was dragged into suffering and disgrace and all manner of vileness. (Incidentally this suggests a useful angle from which to approach the question of sin in general.)

This identification transcends our powers not only of description but even of apprehension : time and space and number seem to be thrown into complete disorder by it, and we can hardly state it in the simplest way without appearing to involve ourselves in hopeless contradiction. Because of it, for instance, we must say that Christ's earthly life of 2,000 years ago *is* (not *was*) each of ours : and that our pain, and the pain of all the world, present and to come, *is* (not *was*) the Passion of Christ, over all this long while past : "I saw," says Mother Julian of Norwich, "I saw a great one-ing betwixt Christ and us, for when He was in pain we were in pain. As long as He was passible He suffered for us and sorrowed for us ; and now He is uprisen and no more passible, yet still He suffereth with us." But with everything against this mystery we still easily accept it, just as with everything against it, we still easily accept the mystery of the Eucharist or of the Blessed Trinity.

So long as men think of Christ as just a great Teacher, however surpassingly great : or as just a model of human perfection, however incomparable : they may admire and love and follow Him, but they cannot *live* Him. They cannot say of themselves, as St. Paul says for himself and for all Christians, "To me to live is Christ and to die is gain" ; nor can they say to one another, "I know nothing amongst you save only Christ Jesus and Him crucified."

"Ah, Christ, if there were naught hereafter it still were best to follow Thee," a poet has said. Perhaps : but if there were naught hereafter, if (as St. Paul says again) "in this life only we have hope in Christ," then Christ might be no less, but He would certainly be no more, worth following than is any other æsthetic ideal : we should be, as St. Paul says in the same verse, "of all men most miserable." For Christ has said that He had come that we might have life and might have it more abundantly—His *own* life, and therefore not a merely human scheme of living, however perfect, but one reaching up to the very level of God's own life, participating in it, possessing it, both now and hereafter.

R. H. J. STEUART.

Queen of Peace

SAVAGE and swift a thousand shapes of doom
 Across the world shatter and slay : a night
 Of evil happenings enshrouds the light
 Of human kindliness. War's teeming womb
 Spawns terror, anguish, hate : the white-crossed tomb
 Stars the brown desert and the frowning height ;
 Machines like shuttles in fantastic flight
 Weave a wild pattern on their ghastly loom.

Yet Mary's mantle still is overspread,
 Above her brow the crowning stars still gleam,
 In her embrace our tears and sorrows cease :
 Mary, whose heart for all mankind has bled,
 Bears the true Light to quench this evil dream,
 In whom is love and kindliness and peace.

T. C.

THE FUTURE OF THE ISLAMIC WORLD

ON November 17th, 1922, Sultan Mohammed VI, last ruler of the House of Othman, quitted the Dolma Bagtche Palace at Constantinople, went on board H.M.S. *Malaya* and sailed for Malta, thus anticipating inevitable déposition at the hands of the Nationalist Government at Angora. At the instance of the Angora Assembly the religious authorities issued a *fatwa* declaring that the imperial fugitive had forfeited the spiritual allegiance of Muslims and was no longer Caliph. Mustafa Kemal now took a step which was without precedent in Turkish history, though it had a partial one in Egypt under the Mameluke dynasty. He separated the Caliphate from the Sultanate, suppressed the second, and conferred the first, divested of all authority in temporal matters, on the son of a former Sultan. In this action Kemal was perhaps inspired by the false analogy often drawn between the Papacy and the Caliphate. It proved to be a compromise of short duration. The new spiritual potentate for a short time rode in state on a white horse to lead the Friday prayers at the Mosque; but before the functions attaching to his office had been fully defined, a thorough-going policy of laicisation had been decided upon by the Turkish Nationalists and the Caliphate was abolished altogether in March, 1924.

The disappearance of this institution after a life of thirteen centuries could not be without its repercussions. It put an end to the so-called "Khalifat" agitation among the Muslims of India to secure the independence of the titular head of the Islamic world. It rendered impracticable, for the time at least, the realisation of the ambitions of the Pan-Islamists. At first there was some talk of reviving the office. The King of the Hejaz was accorded a certain recognition as its holder and was actually proclaimed in Transjordan; but within a few months Mecca was occupied by the Wahhabis and Husain abdicated. The fact that no further attempt has been made to revive the Caliphate is partly to be explained by the liberalising and anti-theocratic tendencies which have of late been at work in the Muslim world, and partly by the fact that the theoretical claims put forward on behalf of the Caliph have for some centuries at least met with but imperfect realisation. The Shi'ah Muslims of Persia and Iraq have never endorsed the Sunnite conception of the Caliph as the temporal ruler of all Muslims, evolved at a time when it was assumed that every believer in the new creed would be living under Muslim rule. Under the vast Empire of the Ommayyads, stretching from the Pillars of Hercules to the banks of the Indus, the Caliphate came near to realising what theorists have claimed for it. But when Baghdad re-

placed Damascus as the capital of the Islamic world the extreme west broke away and a separate Caliphate came into existence at Cordova. The Abbasid Caliphs of Baghdad discarded the democratic way of life which characterized their Ommayad predecessors and surrounded their office with a state reminiscent of that of the Persian and Babylonian kings. But in 1258, their capital was plundered by the Mongols and for two centuries and a half they lived as puppets shorn of all real power under the protection of the Egyptian Sultans.

By this time the Turks had replaced the Arabs as leaders of the Muslim world and in 1517 Selim I occupied Cairo. At the end of the 18th century there became current a story that when Egypt passed under Turkish rule the last Abbasid made over his spiritual authority as Caliph to the Ottoman Sultans. This is now regarded as a fiction; but it proved a valuable means of enhancing their prestige. After the dissolution of the Mogul Empire, Turkey was without a rival, to claim the position of the chief Muslim power, and Turkish agents sought to persuade the Muslims of other countries to look up to the Sultan at Stambul as their spiritual chief. These efforts were not without success. By the treaty of Kuchuk Kaïnarji in 1774, under which Turkey was compelled to cede to Russia the northern coast of the Black Sea, a clause was inserted to the effect that over its Tartar inhabitants the Sultan would continue to exercise spiritual authority as Caliph. Similar clauses were included in subsequent treaties by which Turkey yielded up territory in Europe or Africa. But the Caliph on the Bosphorus never obtained universal recognition even in the Sunnite branch of Islam. The Sultan of Morocco became what Henry VIII aspired to be, the supreme spiritual as well as temporal authority in his own dominions, and lesser potentates in Africa and in the East Indies are so likewise regarded.

If the suppression of the Caliphate by the Turkish nationalists registered the disappearance of a symbol rather than of a reality, yet it gave concrete expression to the fact that for two centuries and a half the Muslim world had been in a state of political disintegration. The process began at the end of the 17th century when Turkey by the Treaty of Carlovitz lost the greater part of Hungary. By 1718 all the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen were free and it was not long before the Ottoman Empire suffered further dismemberment at the hands of the Muscovite. Throughout the 19th century the loss of Muslim territory to Christian powers went on apace; while independent or semi-independent principalities were carved out of the Sultan's dominions. In Europe first Greece, then Roumania, Serbia and Bulgaria achieved nationhood. In Africa France conquered Algeria and Tunisia, Britain occupied, (without however annexing) Egypt, and completed the extension of her authority over Muslim India. In Central Asia the Emirates and Khanates acknowledged Russian suzerainty. The 20th century saw no reversal of this process. Italy

occupied the part of the North African coast lying between Tunisia and Egypt; France proclaimed a protectorate over Morocco and Austria abolished the last vestiges of Turkish rule in Bosnia and the Herzegovina. In Europe Turkey lost Albania, Macedonia and Western Thrace. Except in Albania, where the adherents of Islam constituted more than half the population, the abolition of Turkish sovereignty in Europe has been followed by a considerable efflux of the Muslim population. During the years 1914-18 the Islamic peoples failed to show any large measure of solidarity with Turkey and the attempt to proclaim a *jihād* or 'holy war' failed. At the conclusion of the war the Ottoman Empire crumbled away, being replaced by a Turkish nationalist state embracing Eastern Thrace, Asia Minor and Kurdistan, while a group of Arab principalities enjoying various degrees of autonomy arose. Islam had set out to propagate itself by the sword and now the infidel had triumphed. The great majority of Muslims were living under non-Muslim rule or in states over which the unbeliever exercised a virtual control, even if veiled by discreet diplomatic phrases. To all these losses there has been no counterpoise in the way of gains such as occurred when Muslim expulsion from the Iberian Peninsula was counter-balanced by expansion in South-eastern Europe. Turkey, as the most powerful independent Islamic state which remained, might have drawn advantages from this position; but she preferred a policy of secularist nationalism regarding her traditional faith as a symbol of subjection to Arabia. Will the territorial changes which have brought the majority of Muslims under the rule of non-Islamic governments lead ultimately to a modification of their creed or is it possible that Islamic unity will be recreated on the basis of a vast military empire as the peoples of Europe weaken themselves through internecine strife?

Like Protestantism, Islam was both a religious and a nationalist movement. As the Reformation was an act of assertion on the part of the northern peoples of their independence of Rome, so the Mohammedan conquests were the means by which the Arab put forward his claim to rank among the great nations of the earth. As the propagator of a new faith the Arab merchant enjoyed, not less, but greater influence. The children of the desert, as they swept in conquering hordes to the Atlantic and the frontiers of India, imposed their sway not merely over the bodies but over the minds of men, making their form of monotheism an instrument of imperialist expansion. Their creed, which has been called the "least original" of the world's faiths, was a syncretistic system compounded of elements drawn from Christianity, Judaism and the old heathenism of the Arabian tribes. These three were welded together by the genius of one man. Among the peoples of Semitic speech the Arabs were the last to have their names writ large on the pages of history. Babylon, Nineveh, Tyre and Carthage, even Jerusalem, itself, had seen the day of their greatness

pass before the Arab emerged from the wastes of the desert. When Mohammed began to make proselytes to his doctrine Arabia was in a state of disunity. At his death it had achieved a considerable degree of political cohesion on the basis of belief in one God. The foundation of his system was the unification of mankind through the abolition of polytheism. But Mohammed found two monotheistic religions—Judaism, the elder, and Christianity the younger—already in existence. He aimed at incorporating them into his system. In Abraham he found a figure whom both Jew and Christian venerated. The patriarch had lived before the discipline, either of the Mosaic law or of the Gospel, had been promulgated; but was nevertheless a worshipper of the true God and Mohammed sought to revive his religion. Among the prophets he counted, not merely, Adam and Noah who lived before Abraham, but Moses and Christ who came after him. He placed the coping-stone on his theological edifice by announcing himself as the supreme and final revealer of the will of the Most High. In its relations with its three classes of opponents, idolaters, Jews and Christians, the religion of the Arabian prophet has been most favourably disposed towards the second. He made a gesture towards the Christians by including Our Lord among the prophets of God, thus implicitly rejecting the view, current among Jews of the day, that He was an impostor.

Nevertheless Islam has closer affinities with Judaism than with Christianity. The genius of the Jewish people has in some way impressed itself on nearly all the great spiritual or intellectual movements of the last two thousand years. In modern times we can trace its influence on Protestantism, on Freemasonry, on Socialism and on Communism. Yet none of these can or should be regarded as of exclusively Jewish inspiration. Neither should Islam. Jew and Muslim have to some extent shared a common attitude towards Christianity. Misunderstanding the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, they have hesitated to regard Christians as the professors of as pure a monotheism as their own, and in the rabbinical view the conversion of a Jew to Islam is probably a less grave offence than his conversion to Christianity. To the affinity between Judaism and Islam we may compare also the affinity between Islam and certain forms of Protestantism. It has often been noted that Englishmen have a kind of instinctive respect towards the Arabian creed, even comparing it very favourably with Popery. When Queen Elizabeth sought an alliance with Sultan Murad III for the purpose of punishing 'the proud Spaniard and the impostor Pope' she appealed to him on the plea of common hatred of idolatry, styling herself *verae fidei contra idolos propugnatrix*, and the statesman Sinan Pasha told the imperial ambassador that all that was necessary to turn the English into good Muslims was for them to lift their fingers and make the profession of faith. We may notice also a certain resemblance between Islam and

Communism which in its contemporary form owes much of its vitality to its Jewish exponents. Though the man who strives to unite mankind on the basis of belief in one God may be in a sense poles asunder from him who would unify it on the basis of dogmatic atheism; yet in the followers of Mohammed, theoretically at war with all believers, we have a parallel to the idea of a Communist state, theoretically at war with all capitalist societies.

Will Islam accept as something final its loss of temporal power and seek henceforth to propagate itself by persuasion or will it, taking advantage of the exhaustion of Europe, rebuild with the sword a theocratic state comparable to that of the ancient Caliphs? Side by side with the loss of political independence on the part of Muslim states there has accrued to Islam a great accession of converts among the dark races of Africa and it is conceivable that, in the event of a breakdown of European rule in the regions they inhabit, a native empire based on the Koran might arise. But north of the tropic of Cancer nationalism is exercising a disintegrating effect on the traditional conception of the Islamic state and, although in Arab countries nationalism is hardly separable from Islam, yet elsewhere nationalist movements are in varying degrees hostile to the Pan-Islamic ideal. No less hostile to it has been the phenomenon of westernization, bred of a sense of inferiority caused by the spectacular achievements of the West. This phenomenon began before the 19th century had reached its mid-term. Sultan Mahmud II (1808-1839) massacred the Janissaries and laid the foundations of a Turkish army on the European model. His son, Abdul Medjid, began the reform of the imperial administration along western lines. By article VII of the Treaty of Paris, Turkey was formally admitted to the comity of European nations and in 1867 Sultan Abdul Aziz paid a state visit to Europe, the "Commander of the Faithful", receiving during his tour the freedom of the City of London. The "Committee of Union and Progress" which seized power on the deposition of Abdul Hamid II in 1909 was largely composed of agnostics. The time was not yet ripe for a thorough-going secularizing policy such as was pursued by Kemal Pasha; but additional signs of occidentalization became visible and a few Turkish women of ultra-modern propensities discarded the veil.

Though in Egypt the Islamic basis of the state has undergone no such radical transformation as in Turkey, westernization made no inconsiderable strides during the 19th century. Mehemet Ali sent young Egyptians of the upper classes to be educated in France and Khedive Ismail sought to convert Cairo into an oriental Paris. There has as yet however been no abrupt break with Islamic custom and the Rector of the El Azhar University still occupies a position which has been compared with that of the Archbishop of Canterbury in this country. In Persia western influences began to be felt later than in

Turkey and Egypt. Shah Nasir-ud-Din, an enemy of innovation, declared that he wished to have ministers who did not know whether Brussels was the name of a city or of a cabbage, but of late a different spirit has manifested itself. The nationalist movements of eastern states have of course drawn a large measure of their inspiration from the nationalism of Europe ; but in Mohammedan countries they have awakened a sense of continuity with the pre-Islamic past. In Persia the name of the country has been recently changed to Iran, ' the land of the Aryans,' a change indicating a sentiment that the modern Persian or Iranian looks back with pride to the age of the Great Kings. In Egypt recently the King was present at the opening of a royal tomb in the Delta, belonging to the dynastic period, as though to show that he regarded himself as the successor of the Pharaohs as well as of the Caliphs, and the fellahin also, despite their idolatry and his Mohammedanism, feels that he too belongs to the Egypt of the Pharaohs. Now in strict Islamic theory the Achaemenian rulers of Persia and the sovereigns of Memphis and Thebes belonged to the ' age of ignorance ' before the Koran had shed its light on mankind. The strict Muslim regarded them as an old-fashioned Protestant regarded mediæval bishops. In liberalism Islamic rigidity has encountered another solvent. Contact with western thought has bred in many Muslims a spirit of scepticism or at least of latitudinarianism which regards Christianity rather as a sister religion than as a superstition calling for extirpation. Even in the last century Abd-el-Kader of Mascara, the celebrated North African amir, tersely summed up this attitude when he said that Our Lord, Moses and Mohammed were like three sons of the same man by different mothers, thus implicitly abandoning the claim of Islam to be the exponent of exclusive truth. The influence of Freemasonry has been another factor in helping to break down hostile feeling between Muslims and non-Muslims. Initiations of Muslims occurred as far back as the 18th century and it was through the influence of American freemasons that the abolition of the old distinction in international law between Christian and non-Christian states was brought about.

We should not however allow ourselves to suppose that we are on the eve of mass conversions to Christianity in Muslim lands. The decay of old-fashioned antipathy towards Rome, so marked in England in recent years, does not argue an early return of our country to the bosom of the Church. The tolerant Englishman, who enjoys the society of cultivated Catholics and in speaking or writing expresses appreciation of certain aspects of their faith, has usually not the slightest intention of embracing it. Neither must the cultivated Muslim, who has studied at a western university and sees much to admire in Christianity, be regarded as a potential neophyte. But the spirit of liberalism, which is to-day modifying the outlook of the educated classes in Muslim lands, may create an atmosphere in which

conversion to Christianity will expose the convert to less personal danger than heretofore. If prophecy be not too rash we may perhaps visualise North Africa as the part of the Muslim world in which a revival of Christianity will first take place. Here a great part of the population has been but superficially converted to Islam and there are tribes imperfectly Islamized, who count by solar instead of lunar months, eat the flesh of the wild boar and omit the practice of circumcision. Here also the bulk of the population has the same racial constituents as that of southern Europe.

HUMPHREY J. T. JOHNSON.

For a Sailor

(*Obras son amores,—no palabras.*—Saint Ignatius.)

My sailor has gone back to sea,
To risk his precious life for me.
Please, God, to keep him safe each day!
I've only words with which to pray,—
But cherubim and seraphim
Are walking hand-in-hand with him.

My sailor prays with deeds instead
That shine with an immortal light.
Not words, but deeds, Ignatius said,
Shall find true favour in Thy sight.
We lesser ones can only pray
With words that sound remote and dim,—
But cherubim and seraphim
Are guiding him upon his way.

In some black night, at moments rent
By distant flashes,—worn and spent
With sleeplessness and constant strain,
Deaf with the anguish of each crash,—
He saw the joy of living plain.
In some dark night, lit by the flash
Of high explosive, cherubim
And holy angels talked to him
About the mystery of pain.

My sailor has gone back to sea.
He smiled,—he was so glad to go!—
“For even if I die, I'll know
That you can live and still be free.
I am the lucky one,” he said.
Please, God, to keep him safe each day!
I've only words with which to pray,—
A sailor prays with deeds instead.

HELEN NICHOLSON.

THE SOURCES OF THE BEVERIDGE REPORT

THERE is no reason to believe that the Beveridge Committee had any very definite political colour. The representatives of Government departments who composed it stand apart from party politics by their very profession of civil servants, and we have no means of knowing whether, as individuals, they hold any definite views on political philosophy. Probably they resemble most of their countrymen in being quite empirical, content to meet political problems as they arise and to try to find practical solutions and compromises which will be accepted by that indeterminate but powerful force, public opinion. At any rate, the chairman of the Committee, Sir William Beveridge, claims that in his Report the British people becomes articulate, and that even before the Report was made there was much agreement upon almost all its main principles.

My Report represents to a very large extent the greatest measure of common agreement in the views of those who have thought most seriously upon its problems. This is what I tried to make it. I tried to make a Beveridge Report which would really be the British people become articulate about what they want in the way of social security.¹

In this way, by weaving together various strands in the great mass of evidence submitted to the Committee, by selection and combination, rather than by theoretical considerations of the functions of the State in relation to its citizens, the Report was constructed.

This is not to say that Sir William Beveridge has no political philosophy. He has, though so far as he has expressed it in speeches (mainly since his Report was published) it is not very profound. Perhaps its very empiricism makes it typical of the British man-in-the-street. The State must undertake national planning, though it must respect the essential liberties of citizens. It must aim at freeing the community from the five giant evils, want, disease, ignorance, squalor and idleness, and for this task all its powers must be used, subject only to preserving the essential liberties. There must be changes in the machinery of Government, but not unnecessary changes. There must be an Economic General Staff for national planning, and "different types of people and different types of training and different types of organization" in the Civil Service. But the Parliamentary System must be retained. Then, all too quickly, Sir William crosses deeper water. "Is there no moral purpose for the British community, and for the British individual?" In reply, he suggests that for the

¹ *Pillars of Security*, by Sir W. Beveridge, p. 143. (Allen & Unwin.)

community it is the reconciling of security with individual liberty and responsibility ; for the individual, the ideal of doing something in his daily life which is not for the gain of himself or his family, something done for the good of the community, local, national, international. But he guards himself against being understood in a totalitarian sense. "The individual is more than the State, and is the object for which the State exists. There must be as many separate aims as there are separate lives in the State." In the concluding paragraph of this address¹ he appealed to his audience not to discuss abstractions, but a series of concrete problems, of specific evils, of want, disease, ignorance, squalor, idleness, to be attacked by a concerted campaign.

There is evidently much in common between these views and Catholic political theory : the rejection of *laissez-faire* on the one hand and totalitarianism on the other, the insistence on the importance of personal rights, the limitation of the functions of the State to the provision of those external conditions which facilitate the private welfare of the citizens, the duty of the individual to take account of the good of the various communities of which he is a member. But although general opinions of this sort are a useful indication of the speaker's attitude to political problems they are too sketchy to be called a political philosophy. To take only one example, the matter of "essential liberties". Translated as "personal rights" they are the touchstone of political theory, since they express the limits to the authority of the State. At Oxford, Sir William Beveridge said that the essential British liberties include freedom of worship, freedom of speech, writing, study and teaching, freedom of association and making of new parties of every kind, freedom of choice of occupation, and freedom of spending a personal income. In an address to the Engineering Industries Association in July 1942² he gave a slightly different list : freedom of opinion and its expression, in public or private, in speech or writing ; freedom of association for political and other purposes ; freedom of movement and choice of useful occupations ; personal property and an income of one's own, with freedom to save or spend it. But he explicitly says that "private control of means of production, with the right to employ others at a wage in using those means" is not an essential liberty, because only a tiny fraction of British people have ever enjoyed that right. A political philosopher would want to know the basis of these liberties or rights ; what principle is behind their selection ; to what limitations they are subject, and so on. In particular, he would ask how freedom of movement and of choice of occupation is to be reconciled with the sanctions which accompany unemployment and disability benefit proposed in the Beveridge Report, and how freedom to spend or save

¹ At Oxford, 6th December, 1942 ; reprinted in *Pillars of Security*, p. 80.

² *Pillars of Security*, pp. 48-9.

is compatible with compulsory social insurance contributions. Doubtless Sir William Beveridge would reply that one must not expect a full analysis of the subject in popular addresses ; perhaps, too, that he is not interested in "abstractions" so much as in "concrete problems". The trouble is that unless we have our abstract principles fairly clear we may go badly wrong in our efforts to solve concrete problems. Probably one would not be far wrong in thinking that Sir William's principles are, in a general way, those of neo-liberalism, with its inheritance of the creed of individual liberty modified by a realization that the State must be more than a King Log ; and that he was influenced by these principles in choosing between contradictory proposals made to the Committee by those who gave evidence before it.

Be that as it may, it is of interest to follow his own suggestion that we should compare some of the memoranda submitted to the Committee¹ with the proposals of the Beveridge Report ; at least, so far as the limits of a short article permit. He specially refers us to the memoranda of the Association of Municipal Corporations, the Trades Union Congress, the Shipping Federation and the National Council of Women of Great Britain. "All those bodies, generally interested in social insurance and not in one side of it only, and other bodies of general interest, such as Political and Economic Planning, put up proposals agreeing on practically all those main principles", viz. a unified comprehensive scheme of social insurance to be administered by one Department, to provide cash benefits adequate in amount and in time without a means test, at a flat rate of benefit in return for a flat rate of contribution.² To a certain extent they differed among themselves, but, as already said, it is claimed that the Report represents to a very large extent the greatest measure of common agreement.

To begin with the National Council of Women, it would appear that Beveridge took from its memorandum the three famous Assumptions of his Report, viz. a system of children's allowances, a national health and rehabilitation service, and the prevention of mass-unemployment. The Council asks that our existing schemes of social insurance, including their administrative machinery, be scrapped, and replaced by a new and unified scheme. Against the existing schemes it objects that the provision they make is inadequate, that their complexity makes it difficult for the insured to understand their rights or duties, that the benefits vary inequitably as between the different schemes, that they are all unfair to women, that there is insufficient provision for rehabilitation, and that they are expensive to administer and wasteful of energy. The Council asks for an insurance scheme which will provide a subsistence income for all gainfully occupied persons

¹ See Appendix G to the Beveridge Report ; published in a separate volume by H.M. Stationery Office : Cmd. 6405. 2s.

² *Pillars of Security*, p. 142.

when they are prevented from earning by temporary inability to obtain work ("say up to six months"), by temporary incapacity for work due to accident or illness, or by old age; the scheme would not apply to those whose earnings exceeded "say £500 or £600 a year". For prolonged unemployment or disability there should be an Assistance Scheme, administered by the same authority on a case work basis, and subject to a means test. The Council objects *inter alia* to the present system of paying a life-pension to widows on the ground that this enables them to undercut unpensioned women in the labour market; to the Approved Society system of administering National Health Insurance; and to the system of Workmen's Compensation. It favours, for the financing of a reconstructed scheme, a tripartite system of contributions (by employers, workers and the State), men and women contributing at the same rate and receiving the same rate of benefits. It is opposed to considerations of the marriage status of women being introduced into the scheme, which should be unified and national with a localised administration. The Beveridge Report accepts the objections just mentioned; but it differentiates between the rates of contribution to be paid by men on the one hand and women on the other, and is emphatic in giving married women a special status in social insurance. It agrees with the Council in extending social insurance to all gainfully occupied people, abandoning the present limitation to those employed under contract of service, but goes further by bringing into the scheme even those who are not gainfully occupied. And it disregards the income limitation proposed by the Council.

On this last point, the Report agrees with the Association of Municipal Corporations, which wants a comprehensive compulsory insurance scheme which will cover not only persons gainfully occupied but also all other people who have sufficient means to contribute. (The Beveridge Report proposes to give the right to claim exemption from social insurance to non-employees whose total income is below £75 a year.) The Association wishes the scheme to include health insurance, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, widows' and orphans' pensions, old age pensions, blind pensions, war pensions. The rates of benefit should be the same for all forms of interruption of earnings, and should provide a reasonable subsistence minimum with variations to meet family responsibilities, differences of rent and other living costs. They should not be affected by duration of unemployment or incapacity. Unlike the N.C.W., which holds that benefit should never exceed, say, seven-eighths of the average weekly earnings for three months preceding the benefit period, the Association holds that benefit should not be related to wage rates, since its purpose is to meet need. Contributions should be at a flat rate, with provision for voluntary additional contributions to secure additional benefit. The Association raises the question (raised by others) whether there

should be any contribution from employers, in addition to the contributions of the insured persons and the State. No doubt the implication is that employers' contributions are merely passed into prices, and would be more effectively levied by means of income tax. Benefits, the Association says, should be unlimited in duration. There should be a system of public assistance for those in financial need who are not covered by social insurance, to be administered, like social insurance, by one Minister of the Crown. The local authorities would be entrusted with the welfare of those who need "assistance in kind", e.g., treatment or training. The Beveridge Report adopts a flat rate of contributions and benefits, i.e. contributions are not related to the income of the person insured, and benefits are intended to provide a subsistence income irrespective of earnings lost (though the industrial pension for industrial accident or disease, substituted after thirteen weeks for disability benefit, is related to previous earnings). It provides for National Assistance with a means test for those who fall through the meshes of the social insurance scheme, to be administered, like the scheme, by a Minister of Social Security. In accordance with the views of the English Local Authorities, it leaves to them the responsibility of organizing and maintaining institutions for treatment and welfare. On the question of retaining the existing method of employers' contributions to social insurance, the Beveridge Report comes to the conclusion that the arguments in favour of doing so outweigh the arguments on the other side, one of several reasons being that "employers should feel concerned for the lives of those who work under their control, should think of them not as instruments in production, but as human beings". The Report does not ignore the need for making provision for the blind, or the matter of war pensions; but, as against the Association's view that blind people will have to be excluded from compulsory insurance because of inability to contribute, it holds that normally those who become blind will be entitled to ordinary disability benefit or industrial pension by payment of contributions, because now blindness mainly occurs late in life. As for war pensions, it does not adopt the Association's view that they should be included in the social security scheme. After a lengthy discussion of the problem of rent, it decides that the proposal to adjust benefit to the rent actually paid by individuals should, provisionally, be rejected; though it might be possible to diminish the difficulty that variations in rent make a national flat rate of benefit inequitable by having different rates of contributions and benefits in different regions or occupations.

The Memorandum of the Trades Union Congress proposes an inclusive scheme providing a uniform flat rate of benefit in case of unemployment, sickness, maternity, non-compensatable accidents (it wishes to have a separate scheme for workmen's compensation), invalidity, old age, blindness, death and widowhood and orphanhood.

Like the N.C.W. it holds that social insurance should apply to all gainfully occupied persons, but unlike the N.C.W. it rejects an upper income limit. Again like the N.C.W. it objects to widows receiving life pensions merely because they are widows. This last point, as hinted above, has been taken up in the Beveridge Report, which says that "the proposal to abandon the present system, under which pensions for life or till re-marriage are paid to widows irrespective of their family responsibilities, was supported by nearly all witnesses who expressed an opinion to the Committee on this point". The widow's benefit proposed in the Report is limited to thirteen weeks, but the rate is fifty per cent. higher than unemployment and disability benefit; there is also provision for guardian benefit for widows with dependent children, and for training benefit to assist widows to take up gainful occupation. The Report provides for a maternity grant to all women, and for thirteen weeks maternity benefit to married women who are gainfully occupied; but it disagrees with the T.U.C. over workmen's compensation, which it would abolish in its present form, absorbing it into disability benefit. On the other hand, its attitude to Approved Societies closely resembles that of the T.U.C., being opposed to Approved Societies associated with "commercial interests" (concerned with the business of industrial assurance) but ready to compromise with Friendly Societies and Trade Unions giving friendly benefits. It accepts the proposal for a funeral benefit, and the T.U.C.'s demand that there should be a comprehensive national medical service, for which the N.C.W. also pressed. While agreeing with the T.U.C. that the present system of tripartite contributions should be continued, it does not accept the suggestion that the existing proportions paid by insured persons, employers and the State should be changed to 25 per cent., 25 per cent. and 50 per cent. respectively.¹

The memorandum of the Shipping Federation and the Liverpool Steam Ship Owners' Federation begins by saying that "for some years employers have urged that the Social Services should be surveyed as a whole", and proposes that there should be a single national compulsory contributory industrial social insurance scheme, covering unemployment, health insurance, workmen's compensation, and widows orphans and old age pensions, financed by equal contributions from employers and employees and by at least an equal third from the Exchequer. The cash benefits should be the same for the first three of these risks, and "unless a more general scheme of family allowances finds favour" should provide for family benefits. The medical benefits should be the same for accident, disease and illness, whether or not they are due to the fact of employment, and should be available

¹ The memorandum of the Parliamentary Committee of the Co-operative Congress closely corresponds with that of the T.U.C., but it is much more explicit in demanding family allowances paid from the Exchequer.

to the dependants of the insured. There should be a single administrative collecting agency, and probably also a single payment agency. The memorandum discusses the pros and cons of its suggestion that the system of workmen's compensation should be absorbed into social insurance, and on this point should be compared with the memorandum of the N.C.W. and the memoranda from Insurance Offices and various employers' organizations on workmen's compensation (Appendix G of the Beveridge Report, pp. 131-165). The British Employers' Confederation told the Beveridge Committee that "there is a distinct divergence of view between the employers in the different industries on the question of amalgamating that service with the other social services". The Beveridge Report proposes to supersede the present system, and to include provision for industrial accident or disease within the social insurance scheme, but suggests that there should be a special levy on industries to be scheduled as "hazardous". In doing this, Sir William claims that he is taking a middle line between the conflicting views presented to the Committee. After discussing workmen's compensation the Shipping Federation gives its views about benefits and contributions. Briefly, it wants these to be at a flat rate, leaving "a substantial gap" between actual earnings and benefits, in order not to discourage thrift and self-reliance and as a check on "the malingerer and the workshy". Here arises a problem familiar to social reformers. The danger of making idleness at public expense more attractive than work is obvious, and the need for providing a subsistence income for the genuinely unemployed and disabled is, or ought to be, equally obvious. The only solution is to insist that the lowest wage-rates shall be at least somewhat higher than subsistence level. This does not seem to be stated in the Beveridge Report, but Sir William has admitted it in subsequent addresses. At Oxford he said "You must add to your minimum wage legislation", and at the Caxton Hall "The idea of a minimum wage is necessary".¹ Finally, with regard to the controversial question of Approved Societies, the Shipping Federation holds that their only function should be to provide supplementary benefits on a basis of voluntary insurance.

The remaining organization to which Beveridge referred in the passage previously quoted is "P.E.P.", Political and Economic Planning. Its memorandum demands that a decent human needs standard of income be secured to all citizens by (i) minimum wage legislation, (ii) children's allowances, and (iii) social services. Selecting the chief recommendations relevant to this discussion, we find a Ministry of Social Security (accepted by the Beveridge Report), a national health service (also accepted), the supersession of Approved Societies and Workmen's Compensation (accepted with some slight modification), a State funeral benefit (accepted), and changes in the system of widows' pensions (partly accepted). Here too we find the proposal,

¹ *Pillars of Security*, p. 83 and p. 143.

which has found a place in the Report, that unconditional unemployment benefit should be limited to six months. After that period, the Beveridge Report makes attendance at a work or training centre a condition of continuing to receive *benefit*; P.E.P. proposes that the still-unemployed worker should be required to choose either training (at a *wage*) or transference or State Reserve Work Service (at a *wage*). This is an important divergence. But the most striking difference between P.E.P. and the Report concerns the whole principle of social insurance. P.E.P. calls this "a hybrid 'philosophy'", maintaining that ultimately contributory insurance will prove unworkable and that there is a strong case for financing children's benefits, medical services, long-term incapacity cash benefits and pensions out of universal direct taxation of all income-receivers (other than those getting social service incomes). The taxation might take the form of a general income-tax or of a specific social security tax.¹ Beveridge decisively rejects this proposal, both on intrinsic grounds and because "it conflicts with the wishes and feelings of the British democracy" as shown in the evidence submitted to the Committee by the great majority of organizations and persons.

A really adequate study of the sources of the Beveridge Report, its discussions of the pros and cons of alternative suggestions, and its final conclusions, would demand examination not only of the five memoranda to which Sir William Beveridge refers us, and to which this article has almost entirely confined itself, but of all the evidence submitted to the Interdepartmental Committee; and not merely of all the memoranda published in Appendix G to the Report (including those on Approved Societies and Industrial Assurance), but of much other evidence the printing of which has been impossible under war-conditions. But perhaps enough has been said in the preceding pages to illustrate the method pursued in constructing the Report and to shew what the Chairman means by his claim that in the Report "the British people becomes articulate". Whether or not that claim is admitted (presumably the Government either does not fully admit it or does not consider it a decisive political criterion, since it is not prepared to accept the Beveridge Plan without certain changes), it is at any rate clear that a study of the printed evidence submitted is a prerequisite to forming an intelligent judgement about the need for reconstructing the social services, and the merits of the changes in the existing schemes which the Report proposes.²

LEWIS WATT.

¹ The Fabian Society also considers that "the insurance-cum-assistance type of scheme is clearly outmoded", preferring direct taxation to finance benefits, provided that income-tax covers the great mass of working-class incomes. Its memorandum is an outline of a socialist system of social security. For fuller details, see *Social Security*, edited by W. A. Robson (Allen & Unwin: 1943).

² The Report is summarised in *A Catholic View of the Beveridge Plan* (Oxford: Catholic Social Guild, 3d.).

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

ENGLAND'S LEGION OF LOST CHURCHES

GHOST CITIES BENEATH THE WAVES

Fathoms deep ! Fathoms deep
Lies the buried church asleep !
No more psalms and hymns to Heaven,
No more prayers to God are given.
All asleep. Fathoms deep !
Fathoms deep !

ALL round England's shores lie buried ghostly towns and villages, many of which played great parts in the history of England during the Middle Ages. They have been swallowed by the sea, and one of the favourite stories of fishermen is that the bells of their long-vanished churches can be heard ringing when the tide is low, or at certain times of the year.

Some of the places now lying far beneath the grey waters of the North Sea were once thriving ports, such as Dunwich in Suffolk—the nursery of the Christian faith in Eastern England—with half a hundred churches, monasteries, and religious foundations ; further south the once prosperous port of Goseford contributed 15 ships to France in 1452, but it has wholly disappeared ; ancient Orwell, old Winchelsea, and the Roman town of Mablethorpe have all gone ; while in Yorkshire the once thriving towns of Old Hornsea, Ravenspur, and Ravenser (or Ravenser Odd) are among its vanished settlements. It has been stated, as a matter of fact, that Yorkshire alone has lost fifteen towns and ports, all swallowed by the hungry maw of the North Sea.

There is a curious old rhyme associated with the cobblestone church of Hornsea which gives some idea of the coast erosion in Holderness, a coast area of the East Riding. It runs :

Hornsea church steeple, when I built thee
Thou wert ten miles from Beverlee ;
Ten miles from Burlington (Bridlington)
And ten miles from the sea.

To-day the sea is barely a mile away, and even allowing for the deviation from strict accuracy which one must expect in a piece of doggerel, it is impressive proof of the advance which the sea has made on that coast during the past centuries.

One of the places where a legend persists of the ringing of bells beneath the sea is along the Suffolk coast, where only a tiny village represents the great port of Dunwich. In 1923, by the action of a few nearby residents the last remaining buttress of the last church, All Saints, was removed (and only a few weeks before, but for its removal, it would have fallen into the sea), to a position in the existing churchyard, there to remain as a perpetual memorial of the ancient Dunwich churches. The inscription runs : "The north-west buttress of All Saints' Church, the last trace of the

churches of the first East Anglian See, removed from the cliff to this resting place in March, 1923."

Behind lie the remains of a Franciscan priory, forlorn relics of the great port which once returned two members to Parliament, the see of a bishop, and from which many of the Angles were converted. In Norman times Dunwich was a far more important town than Ipswich. Domesday recorded its value as £50 and 50,000 herrings, but also forecast its inevitable end, for even then it spoke of the encroachments of the sea. King John, in gratitude for its help in fitting out vessels to oppose the French, visited Dunwich to grant it a Charter as a free borough. In 1939 the Dunwich Town Trust purchased from the executor of the late Sir Kenneth Kemp, this ancient Charter granted in 1208. For wrecks along its coastline Dunwich paid the king 5,000 eels yearly.

Dunwich remained a port for about 200 years, and so powerful was it that in 1173 the sight of its strength caused Robert, Earl of Leicester, to despair of besieging it. An idea of its size and importance can be gained from the fact that for supplying the enemy with corn in the reign of Richard I, Oxford was fined 15 marks, Ipswich and Yarmouth 200 marks, and Dunwich 1,060 marks. It was written of the town: Dunwich was "surrounded by a stone wall and brasen gates. . . . It boasted 52 churches, chapels and religious houses and hospitals; a king's palace, a bishop's seat, a mayor's mansion, and even a mint." Dunwich supplied ships of war to the Plantagenet kings and minted its own coinage; it had a great fleet of ships trading to Iceland and the Continent, and had a large fishing fleet too.

Yet as early as the fourteenth century the North Sea had given Dunwich its death-blow. A great storm in 1328 choked up the harbour, and a similar catastrophe overtook a new one which the people constructed. By 1349, 400 houses, windmills and other buildings had gone. Five years later the churches of St. Leonard, St. Felix, St. Martin, and St. Nicholas fell prey to the ever-advancing sea. Randolph Agas wrote in 1509: "The Toune of Dinwic a Coaste toune neare the middle of the sheire is scituate upon a cliffe fortie foot hie. The auntient Haven there was sometime at the northe ende of the toune wher standeth now their Keie, which Haven was utterly choaked upp with a Northe Easte winde the fortene daie of Januarie Anno Edward III. It appeareth as well by their Charter as other wise that it hath been one of the auntienst townes with a Bishoppes Sea, also a minte, and a market everie daie in the week. . . ."

By the middle of the sixteenth century it is said that only about one quarter of the town remained. In despair an appeal was made to Elizabeth, but the ocean is stronger than monarchs, and the waters remorselessly tore the once wealthy port from the cliffs. In 1702 St. Peter's church was "obliged to be broken down," and two years later the town-hall and gaol were destroyed. Almost final destruction followed in 1759, when for days the wind howled from the north-east, piling the billows on to the town. Masses of cliff collapsed, and the waters flooded the remaining buildings, even levelling two 40-ft. hills and exposing an ancient cemetery. The inroads of the sea continue.

Further north the sea has swallowed Old Cromer, and here again one finds the local legend of ringing bells beneath the waters. Cromer formed part of Shipden, from which Robert Bacon made a notable voyage to Iceland. But the inhabitants had to retreat as the waves advanced and the church toppled over the crumbling cliff, the present fine building being put

up in the fourteenth century. In the middle of the eighteenth century a chronicler wrote : " At very low tides there are still to be seen, nearly half a mile from the cliffs, large masses of walls, composed of square flints, which sailors denominate the church rock." In 1800 a local versifier wrote :

The affrighted fishman the temple spies
Below the waves ; and oft the mariner,
Driven by the whirlwind, feels his vessel strike
Upon the tangled mass.

A few miles further south the famous " Garden of Sleep," immortalised by Clement Scott, has gone. This was the churchyard and tower of Sidestrand Church, which stood on the cliff top surrounded by masses of brilliant poppies in summer. The old village has gone, and the church itself was threatened with destruction. So the main part was taken down and rebuilt 600 yards further inland, mainly at the cost of the father of Sir Samuel Hoare. The tower stood sentinel on the cliff for some years, until it too met its inevitable end, falling to the shore in 1916. Another church that has been swallowed is Eccles, between Cromer and Yarmouth. An author wrote in a London newspaper a little time back : " A few years ago the ruined tower of Eccles Church stood up from the beach like a solitary tooth, abandoned nearly 300 years ago, for the parish had all but vanished. Two thousand acres had been lost by the irruption of the sea. But the honest work of the old church-builders, dressed flint and mortar, long acted as a kind of breakwater hereabouts. The sand banked up against the tower and preserved what little is left of the village, a few acres at most. But the tower has now toppled over and is almost engulfed in sand." Now only a few stones can be seen.

Along the Yorkshire coast the sea has made great inroads, for since Caesar landed, an area half the size of Middlesex has been engulfed. Withernsea has suffered severely. In 1488 the old church was washed away and a new one was built behind the cliffs. This suffered from storms, for in 1609 gales unroofed it and it stood a pathetic ruin until 1859, when it was restored. Owthorpe Church was swallowed as well, the tradition being that this and Withernsea Church were built by two sisters. Old Kilnsea was a victim of the North Sea. As late as 1822 it had a church and 30 houses, but now all are under the waves, the tower of the church falling after a great storm in 1830. At Aldbrough, a few miles north, a sundial was rescued from a church under the sea. Birstall Priory, which stood nearly a mile south of Skeffling, and whose ruins were still to be seen in 1721, has been entirely swept away.

Turning to the south of England, the visitor to Selsey Bill looks out over a stretch now covered by the sea, which was once clothed with luxuriant forest abounding with red deer. At the bottom of the Channel off Selsey are the stones of the cathedral that preceded Chichester, one of the few cathedrals in the country visible from the sea. The waves dashed over the earlier church, the top of whose steeple was on a level with the keyhole of St. Richard's porch at Chichester.

Kent has suffered from the inroads of the sea. Tenterden, standing on the fringe of hills bordering Romney Marsh, is noted for its wide and beautiful main street and for its steeple. Old Thomas Fuller, in " The Worthies of England " (1662), mentions, with apparent belief in " a rational tale," the tradition of the steeple in that commentary on the

English counties : "Time out of mind money was constantly collected out of this county (Kent) to fence the east banks thereof against the irruption of the seas ; and such sums were deposited in the hands of the Bishop of Rochester. But, because the sea had been very quiet for many years, without any encroachings, the Bishop commuted that money to the building of a steeple and endowing of a church in Tenderden. By this diversion of the collection for the maintenance of the banks the sea afterwards broke in upon Goodwin Sands."

A notable Kentish victim was the ancient settlement of Reculver, once a Roman port. Parts of the early English church taken down because of the encroachments of the sea, are preserved in the modern church of St. Mary. A residence of King Ethelbert of Kent lies beneath the waves close to Herne Bay.

E. R. YARHAM.

2. FRA POZZO

WE keep this year the third centenary of the birth of Andrea Pozzo, laybrother in the Society of Jesus and a very remarkable artist. It is true that he was born in 1642 but, in the Roman way of reckoning, a centenary is not kept until the completion of the year which makes up the hundred, so that it is 1943 which sees this artist honoured. He is very well known by English visitors to Rome who, guide-book in hand, go to see his famous frescoes in the Church of Sant'Ignazio.

Andrea Pozzo, then, was born in 1642 at Trent and, at the age of 26 being already an accomplished artist, he entered the Society of Jesus and made his noviceship at Arona. After working for some time in Piedmont, he was called to Rome by his General, Fr. Oliva. It was the artist, Carlo Maratta, who advised the General to send for Pozzo and, once in Rome, he found an abundance of work waiting for him. He worked in Rome till 1702 when the Emperor Leopold asked that he might be sent to Vienna and it was at Vienna that he died in 1709.

His great paintings in the Church of Sant'Ignazio date from 1687 to 1694 and it is matter for amazement that they could have been finished in that time, seeing that they are on a gigantic scale and contain a veritable multitude of figures.

Pozzo himself has given us an explanation of the huge fresco on the long vault of the nave, in a letter which will be published shortly, so that the usual interpretation which limits the artist's intention to showing St. Ignatius entering Heaven must be discarded. His ideas were far more grandiose and spiritual. His plan was this :—A ray of powerful light, streaming from the august Trinity, falls upon St. Ignatius who, under that sublime inspiration, sends forth the fire of charity to the four quarters of the earth by means of his sons, who even then were labouring with unshakable zeal and heroism. The throng of souls saved by their efforts are seen, borne into Heaven by the Saints of the Society. The wheel has come full circle. The word of the Lord has gone forth and has not returned to Him void but its operation has required Saints and heroes to fulfil it. The fresco is a short-hand history—how compressed !—of that "least Company" of Jesus.

What place does this great painting take in the history of European art? We have all seen the earnest students, the tourists, the peasants from the hills and the Campagna, who stand in the middle of the nave gazing upward at Pozzo's noble architecture, his swirling clouds, his thronging figures, the exceeding light and glory of his picture. Spectators must change their position many times, for it is only from one spot that the whole composition, drawn upon a curved vault, falls into due order and perspective, leaving them amazed at the artist's technical skill and mastery. It is all magnificent but what else?

Western art, developing organically throughout several periods, was dominated by each of the great arts in turn. The Medieval period, Romanesque and Gothic, Romanesque flowering or flaming into Gothic, was above all architectural and to its clear crystalline science of space, painting and sculpture alike were subjected. The Renaissance saw the triumph of sculpture over both architecture and painting; every work of art was full of plastic values and with these Bramante and Michael Angelo were always preoccupied. When the problems involved in setting a cupola over a solid "Roman" building had been magisterially solved, we come into the period of Baroque art—the dream of filling enclosed spaces with life and the movement of life obsessed the mind of every artist. Could limited space be made to suggest infinity? Could dead marble vibrate with life? Could solid walls show a living rhythm? Bernini and Borromini answered these questions, but it was Andrea Pozzo who answered in the name of painting and, in his great fresco, blended into one organic whole the architecture of the Church and his own painted structure, by means of a consummate perspective, of wheeling angels, of saints ascending, of floods of light by which we are led through spaces more and more profound, to St. Ignatius in glory, to the open heavens, to the very sanctuary of the Trinity. This and no less was Pozzo's intention and it is little wonder that many of his contemporaries took him as their master and inspirer. He had indeed great influence upon the art of Austria and of central Germany.

But it seemed as if the fountain of inspiration had run dry and the 18th and 19th centuries did but repeat, amplify and revive what had gone before; for little profound or original work was done after Baroque had had its say. Themes were apparently exhausted and the day of variations had come. A fourth art however—music—to which the words 'theme' and 'variation' properly belong, reached a splendour and accomplishment never hitherto known. We have witnessed many things in this 20th Century but no prophet has given us any light as to the future.

M. G. CHADWICK.

God, through Whom we serve well and govern well.
 God, through Whom petty things do not degrade us.
 God, Who dost strip us of that which avails not and dost clothe us
 with that which hath value in His sight.
 God, Who dost call us back into the way.
 God, Who dost lead us up to the door.
 God, Who dost cause it to be opened to them who knock.
 (ST. AUGUSTINE. *Soliloquies*, I. i, 3.)

II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES

- BLACKFRIARS** : July, 1943. **Christian Life in the World To-day.** [A synopsis of some of the addresses given by Catholic speakers at the Religion and Life week, recently held in Rugby.]
- BROTÉRIA** : April, 1943. **Tolstoi Anarquista**, by Abílio Martins. [A study of the moral and social teaching of Count Tolstoi which underlines its weak points and its dangers.]
- CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW** : April, 1943. **Survival of the Catholic Faith in the Sixteenth Century**, by Henry S. Lucas. [Considers one aspect of Catholic survival and revival—namely that of the men and women who led devout lives and wrote spiritual manuals for the rejuvenation of the faith and the reform of the Church.]
- CATHOLIC WORLD** : May, 1943. **John Gunther a "Good Neighbour,"** by Dominic De La Salandra. [A careful review of a much-publicized work on South America, with the protest that the "Good Neighbour" policy will not be forwarded by books that contain "numerous errors, discrepancies and misleading statements."]
- CLERGY REVIEW** : **A Mystical Bypass of Christianity**, by Rev. Ethelbert Cardiff, O.F.M. [An acute study of Aldous Huxley's "Grey Eminence" which, while it pays tribute to Mr. Huxley's sincerity, questions his competence to write of mysticism and disputes his antithesis between mystical experience and Christian dogma.]
- COLUMBIA** : May, 1943. **Spanish Enigma**, by Thomas F. Woodlock. [Mr. Woodlock argues that no nation is perhaps more foreign to the general North American atmosphere than is Spain, and that none is probably more thoroughly misunderstood.]
- COMMONWEAL** : May 28th, 1943. **Soviet Culture To-day**, by Helen Iswolsky. [An illuminating article on the change of emphasis in Russian literature, which seems to show that "the mood of Russia, of the Russian people, has changed, and has changed not only for the duration."]
- IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD** : June, 1943. **Summus Sacerdos Principalis Offerens**, by Rev. William Moran, D.D. [The third of a series of theological articles in which Dr. Moran argues vigorously in favour of Père de la Taille's explanation of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.]
- SIGN** : June, 1943. **Mexico's Peaceful Counter-Revolution**, by John W. White. [A non-Catholic expert on Mexican problems examines the new *Union Nacional Sinarquista* and judges it to be "a Catholic, agrarian, counter-revolution against the very Leftist social revolution which has controlled Mexico for thirty years."]
- STUDIES** : June, 1943. **Ireland in the Seven Years War**, by Professor Michael Tierney. [Professor Tierney stresses the view that the Jacobite cause still flourished in 1756 and perished only with the peace of 1763.]
- SWORD OF THE SPIRIT** : July 8th, 1943. **The International Message of the Church**, by Christopher Dawson. [A timely reminder that within the Church there is a seed of unity and a promise of peace to the nations, and that it is only on the basis of such a spiritual principle that the reconciliation of the nations is ultimately possible.]
- TABLET** : July 3rd, 1943. **The Poles and the Soviet Union.** [Some helpful facts that must not be forgotten in discussions on post-war reconstruction.]

REVIEWS

1.—THE MODERN CRISIS¹

THE thorough adherent of the Bonaventuran philosophy would probably say that a man who perceives the ills of humanity, but does not at the same time realise that they can be healed only through the Word, is necessarily in error. Yet, whether such a man is definitely in error or has correct, though inadequate, knowledge, it is certainly true that, the greater the evils which are perceived, the more lamentable is the failure also to perceive where the true remedy lies. There can scarcely be any among us now who do not see that humanity has somehow or other got off the right track, and the less superficial thinkers realise too that the plight into which man has brought himself is a result of the increasing despiritualisation and materialisation of man and human civilisation; but the number is smaller of those who are prepared openly to admit that the decline of the West is due to that breach of contact and continuity with the living and dogmatic Christian tradition which began towards the close of the Middle Ages and which has increasingly widened in our modern era, and who consequently proclaim that the salvation of the West can come only through a regaining of living contact with that tradition.

That a Catholic writer should realise this truth and proclaim it in clear terms is only to be expected, and Dom Aelred Graham, O.S.B., in his inspiring and wholly admirable little book, considers the modern crisis and its problems, particularly in relation to the present war, in the light of the truths of the Faith, for it is only in the light of those truths that we can attain anything approaching an adequate view of human history. Although, as he rightly says, it may be necessary, for scientific or pedagogic purposes, to limit the investigation of a series of events to an examination of their more immediate causes, it would be wrong to suppose that such a treatment of history is exhaustive or adequate. "If the Christian claim be true there can be no such thing as merely 'secular' history." It is, therefore, no theological irrelevance, but the very truth, when the author finds the root of mankind's maladies in original and actual sin, which manifests itself in "human self-centredness," that *anthropocentrism* and turning-away from the transcendent Ground of all things which is at the root of the moral evil in the world and which (even prescindng from what we know of the effects of the Fall) is obviously the cause of not a little of the physical evil that men have to bear. Nor is this theological explanation of evil irrelevant to actual conditions, for what is Nazism but *anthropocentrism* in an extreme form, an unveiled manifestation of human self-centredness on a grand scale? Moreover, if the present ills of mankind are due ultimately to human egoism, it is of extreme importance, and highly relevant, to realise that the true solution of our difficulties lies in substituting *theocentrism* (with the consequent brotherhood of man) for *egocentrism*: it is the theorists who imagine that the way out of the maze lies in substituting one form of

¹ (1) *The Final Victory* (Present Problems Series). By Dom Aelred Graham, O.S.B. London: Burns, Oates. Pp. 100. Price: 3s. 6d. n. (cloth), 2s. 6d. n. (paper). 1943.
(2) *The Crisis of the Modern World*. By René Guénon. Translated by Arthur Osborne. London: Luzac and Co. Pp. 170. Price: 6s. n. 1943.

egocentricism for another that are the irrelevant and short-sighted dabblers. "In, and through, the Church alone is self-centredness to be overcome; for not otherwise than by the acceptance of Christ can the human spirit be cured of its deep-seated pre-occupation with self and centred upon God."

If Dom Aelred Graham is concerned with viewing man's present situation in the light of the truths of Faith, M. René Guénon is concerned rather with showing how our western civilisation of the whole modern era should be seen as a decline, without treating specifically of present conditions, which are but the result of that decline and a quickening of the tempo as a cycle of history nears its close. M. Guénon is not apparently an orthodox Christian, but he is a firm believer in the primacy of the spiritual and, when he traces the decline of the West to a progressive materialisation, we are in full agreement. The spirit of modern civilisation has been, and is, anti-traditional, and since religion is part of tradition and the western tradition in particular means the Christian tradition, the decline of the West has shown itself in an increasing revolt against the traditional Christianity of the Middle Ages, in anthropocentrism and anti-spiritualism. Once the spiritual nature of man as a God-dependent and Godward-directed being is lost sight of, "progress" comes to mean the increasing independence of man and also an increasing pre-occupation with man's material needs. The result of "Humanism," the cutting of the links with spiritual reality, is the growing enthronement of matter that may in the end display itself in the worship of force and power or in the materialistic ideal of a machine-like society. Spirit is "quality" and matter "quantity," and western despiritualisation and materialisation denote an enthronement of quantity, an enthronement of quantity that may take, for example, the form of the Nazi power-complex or of the materialistic Marxist ideal. In his thoughtful and penetrating book M. Guénon traces the decline of the West in this sense back beyond the Reformation and the Renaissance to the fourteenth century, when the break with the full Christian tradition really began, and the burden of his message is that there can be no hope of salvation for the West save in regaining a living contact with that tradition.

It is outside the purpose of M. Guénon's book to make practical suggestions as to what we ought to do when the present conflict is at an end (his obvious pessimism in regard to the West is doubtless influenced by his predilection for the East, for Hindu tradition); but Dom Aelred Graham has an interesting chapter on "The Future," in which he discusses principles in connection with the Peace Points of Pius XII and the five standards added to the Peace Points by the late Cardinal, the two Anglican Archbishops and the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council in their joint letter to the *Times* of December 21st, 1940. It is not the business of the Church to formulate economic policies as such, but it certainly is the business of the Church to lay down those moral principles to which all social and economic policies must be conformed: indeed, it is only through an informing of our social, economic and political life by Christian and truly moral principles that the regeneration of the West can be achieved. M. Guénon's book leaves one in some doubt if the author thinks that it is possible to save the modern world from catastrophe (presumably one cannot arrest the working-out of an historical "cycle" to its natural conclusion): Dom Aelred Graham's book, on the other hand, while in no way indulging in a facile (and unchristian) optimism, is sanely hopeful. He points out to us the right way to take, but whether or not mankind in general will take that way (for

which end all true Christians pray and work), is known only to Almighty God.

F. C. C.

2—EARLY BIBLE HISTORY¹

FATHER Johnson already has us in his debt by his valuable additions to our Catholic literature. In the present volume he faces and attempts solutions of the many questions suggested by the first eleven chapters of Genesis. About half the book is devoted to the origin of Man, which is discussed first in its relation to secular knowledge and secondly in the biblical narrative. The remaining chapters deal with the fall of man, "The Early Ages of the World," and the Flood. There is an appendix on the unity of the human race. The title of the last chapter but one, which I have put in inverted commas, is a little misleading with its suggestion that these early parts of Genesis purport to give a history of the whole human race. Their scope is much more limited, being confined to tracing the pre-history of the Chosen Race and to showing the descent of its great father Abraham from our first parents.

It is remarked that university students and schoolteachers are perplexed at the hesitation shown by theologians in accepting positions taken as axiomatic in the world of science. It is possible that under-graduates over-estimate the strength of such positions. The Church has seen scientific opinions come and go, and is wisely cautious. It is notorious that statements are made about evolution that greatly exceed the degree of certainty belonging to the hypothesis. Various fossil remains have been found that reveal types of man differing more from any existing race than existing races do among themselves, and also more primitive in type. But it is recognised that neanthropic man is not descended from palæanthropic man. Neither Neanderthal man nor Pithecanthropus nor Sinanthropus were among his ancestors. Indeed neanthropic man existed contemporaneously with palæanthropic man. And the progress of discovery has shown that the earliest specimens of Neanderthal man are not the ones that present the most marked pithecoïd features. In other words, Neanderthal man shows a deterioration of type. These facts suggest the hypothesis that man has not always been progressing to higher types. These palæanthropic specimens may reveal deteriorating types, and colour is lent to this hypothesis by the admitted fact that they became extinct and left Neanthropus in possession of the field. The main biblical difficulty is that Genesis does not leave scope for the evolution of more than one human body, though if the progress of knowledge should ever raise the hypothesis of the evolution of the human frame to a certainty, this difficulty need not be insuperable.

Specially valuable in Father Johnson's treatment is his emphasis on the necessity of putting aside modern western canons of criticism and interpretation in the study of ancient Oriental literature. Although the books of the Bible were inspired by God, He used human agents for their composition and did not alter their natural and received manner of writing. Effective, too, is his disposal of the accusation that the first two chapters of Genesis contradict each other about the order of creation. In each case the order is logical and not chronological. Excellent also is the explanation

¹ *The Bible and the Early History of Mankind.* By Humphrey J. T. Johnson. London: Burns, Oates. Pp. vi, 169. Price: 4s. 6d. n. 1943.

of the sin of Paradise : " The man and the woman were seeking to possess a knowledge that would raise them to a semi-divine status, though in fact their transgression had the unforeseen consequence of depriving them of control over their passions." It is suggested that Adam's naming of the animals is to manifest his power over them. The context of the naming suggests rather that it is to manifest his adequate knowledge, for a name was conceived to designate the character or nature of the thing named. Adam saw that in the brute creation there was not to be found a partner meet to help him. In his treatment of the fall of man the deterioration of mind and body, spoken of by the Council of Trent, is conceived in terms of the loss of actual physical and mental power. It is generally understood in the simpler and better sense of the deterioration due to the loss of the preternatural and supernatural gifts that had been conferred on our first parents. Very stimulating is the discussion of the meaning of the table of nations in chapter X, but a doubt suggests itself whether sufficient attention is paid to the statement that these races were descended from the sons of Noe. In conclusion I would say that Father Johnson has given us fresh ground for gratitude by presenting us with this learned and interesting study.

E. F. S.

3.—THE LAST OF THE STUART MONARCHS¹

MISS LANE'S portrait of King James II is in the tradition of Mr. Belloc and Mr. M. V. Hay, but she has relied far more than her predecessors upon Stanier Clarke's memoirs.

Her method has its merits and its defects. She has given us a more intimate and vivid portrait of the king than perhaps any modern writer, but it cannot be said that she has produced a well-balanced analysis of the causes which led to the events of 1688.

Miss Lane presents to us the personal tragedy of James II, steadfast and unwavering in his great purpose of establishing conditions in which Catholics might openly practise their religion, free from political or economic penalties. We see this purpose foredoomed to failure, and the king himself too honest and straightforward to stoop to intrigue and double-dealing, utterly outwitted by his unscrupulous and treacherous opponents. Even Miss Lane, it would seem, does not credit James with any capacity for politics, and in this she accepts the general verdict of modern writers.

In the light of the facts, no one could pretend that James had any great political skill, but it is perhaps possible to suggest that his policy was not in all respects so entirely headstrong and foolhardy as it is commonly represented to be by friend and foe alike. As Miss Lane points out, religious toleration was not unknown to the men of the late seventeenth century ; Catholics and Protestants had established a *modus vivendi* in Holland, in Germany and in France. To seek such a solution in England was perhaps not an entirely impossible notion.

Moreover, the position of James, at his accession, was one of considerable strength. The Whigs were cowed after their defeat in 1681, and there were few who had any desire to repeat the experience of the Commonwealth. The reaction from the hysteria of the years of the popish plot might have been thought to create suitable conditions for a new experiment in tolera-

¹ (1) *King James the Last*. Pp. xii, 336. Price, 7s. 6d. n. (2) *England for Sale*. Pp. 344. Price, 9s. 6d. n. Both books by Jane Lane. London : Andrew Dakers, Ltd. 1943.

tion. As Sir John Revesby remarked to the king, the popish plot was not only dead but buried. The ease with which James had crushed the rebellions of Monmouth and Argyll must have confirmed the king and his advisers in the belief that no serious opposition to the Crown was to be expected. At the close of 1685 it may not have been unreasonable for James to expect a fair measure of success in pursuing his policy.

James has been blamed for his lack of judgment in appointing Catholics to positions of authority, military and civil. Yet Charles I had done the same thing without forfeiting the loyalty of his Protestant supporters. James took every care to keep within the law, and submitted the question of his dispensing power to the decision of the judges. His questionnaire concerning the repeal of the Penal Laws and Test Act, addressed to the country gentry, shows that he recognised the necessity of obtaining a considerable body of opinion in favour of his proposals. At times his actions were shrewdly judged, as for example his contemptuous treatment of Titus Oates; ridicule was more politic than martyrdom. His admission of the Huguenot refugees after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes was well-timed. On the other hand, his appointment of Father Petre to the Privy Council was singularly inept.

It is easy to be wise after the event. The verdict that James rushed blindly to inevitable disaster may require some modification. That his policy would arouse mistrust and discontent must have been obvious to all, including James himself, but as to its chances of success, there were powerful arguments both for and against.

Yet the fact remains that disaster did overtake him, and it is evident that James completely under-estimated the strength of the opposition. More important still, he over-estimated the loyalty of those upon whom he thought he could rely. The difference between 1641 and 1688 lies not so much in the strength of the enemies of the monarchy as in the fact that in 1641 the king's friends took up arms, while in 1688 they were apathetic. This seems to have been the deciding factor in the situation, and the reason for this apathy undoubtedly was the widespread belief that James intended to impose Catholicism on the nation, and that his expressed desire for toleration was but a cloak for this design. We may accept the view of Miss Lane that such duplicity was quite out of keeping with James' character, but it is necessary to recognise that many who remained loyal to James believed that he intended to compel the country to accept the authority of the Pope. Even such a man as Sir John Revesby believed it, and Revesby was a staunch upholder of the royal power, refusing to side with those who went over to the Prince of Orange, even though he was a prisoner in their hands, and under the greatest pressure to throw in his lot with the winning side. Sir John was not a man to be deluded by fantastic stories of popish plots, and his opinion must have been held by many of his type. Some unfortunate quality in the king's character must, it seems, have repelled sympathy and understanding. Miss Lane divides the nobility and gentry into sheep and goats; Revesby falls into neither category and it is only by appreciating the position of those he typifies that a full understanding of the Revolution can be sought.

Relying as she does so much on Stanier Clarke's memoirs, Miss Lane has given us only one side of the picture, but it must be added that she has told an absorbing story with a wealth of anecdote and lively incidents, and no one has depicted the end of the Stuart dynasty with such sympathy and insight into the character of the chief actor in that drama. If at times

she appears over-sentimental, the defect is easily forgiven, and her closing pages, in which she describes the dignity and resignation of James in his last years, reach a high level.

One omission seems surprising; Miss Lane has almost neglected the campaign of alarms and false reports which filled the autumn of 1688, and perhaps played a decisive part in the fall of James.

In her novel, *England for Sale*, Miss Lane has translated into fiction the principal elements of the tragedy depicted in her biography. The story is built round a young Catholic gentleman at King James's court, who strives unsuccessfully to warn James of the plans of the conspirators. The personal story of Mr. Michael Montague becomes a vehicle by which Miss Lane gives us her conception of the character of James, permitting herself more latitude than is possible in a biography. Considered as a novel, the reader's interest in the development of the plot is limited by his foreknowledge of the issue. Yet the book is well written, and it says much for Miss Lane's power as a story-teller that she can retain her reader's interest, in spite of the lack of dramatic suspense.

B. MAGEE.

4.—A TIMELY HELP¹

PAPAL documents generally present one difficulty for the normal readers. They are somewhat lengthy, and then, unless they are to be consulted in the original Latin, they must be read in an English version that has not dared to take liberties with the original text and is consequently heavy going. The standard of our English versions has undoubtedly improved, thanks, for example, to Monsignor Knox and Canon George Smith. But a certain difficulty does persist.

Father Philip Hughes has done us a considerable service in presenting detailed outlines of the most important encyclicals that bear on social and political questions. The term "Social" on his title page is too narrow. His work is not intended to do away with the reading of the full texts, but, in a sense, to facilitate that reading, and to allow the reader to have a comprehensive grasp of what the Popes have said during the past seventy years. Turning the pages of this book, one is impressed by the range of problems they have treated, and the profundity of the principles and advice they have enunciated. It will be a godsend to study and discussion groups, so many of which are now functioning vigorously.

It is interesting, for example, to compare the analysis of the world's unrest, as we find it in *Inscrutabili* (Leo XIII), in *Ubi Arcano Dei* (Pius XI) and in *Summi Pontificatus* (Pius XII). Leo XIII stresses the contempt for authority, chiefly that of the Church, and the irresponsibility of the "Liberal" claims; Pius XI analyses the craving for pleasure, for gain and for domination over others—symptoms that have developed from the original "Liberalism." Pius XII emphasizes the neglect of natural right and justice, the new denial of the solidarity of mankind and of human brotherhood, and the evils arising from the autonomous State—a still further development of "Liberalistic" principles that have now recoiled upon their authors and enslaved them, like modern Franksteins.

¹ *The Popes' New Order: Social Encyclicals and Addresses, 1878-1941. A Systematic Summary.* By Philip Hughes. London: Burns, Oates. Pp. viii, 232. Price, 9s. 1943.

Most of the encyclicals summarised in this volume deal with the character and authority of the State and the Catholic attitude towards the Modern State. In the four letters of Pius XI concerning Mexico, as in *Non Abbiamo Bisogno* (for Italy) and *Mit Brennender Sorge* (for Germany) we have practical directives for special crises, though the last-named document posits very clearly the Catholic opposition to Nazi racial and State theories.

Finally, come the strictly Social Encyclicals, *Rerum Novarum* (Leo XIII), *Quadragesimo Anno* (Pius XI) and *La Solennità delle Pentecoste* (Pius XII) : documents on Family Life and Education : and encyclicals, letters and addresses dealing with the international situation.

Father Hughes has given us an admirable volume. The documents are clearly and concisely analysed ; their major points are noted ; and it is easy to compare them. There is a very slight—perhaps all too slight—historical setting.

"THE MONTH" FORWARDING SCHEME

It is with special gratitude that we wish to thank all those who have assisted the Forwarding Scheme during the past year. It has meant, we know very well, a real sacrifice. But never was a gift more appreciated—to judge from the letters we receive. We are asked continually for more and more copies ; we should be most grateful for further subscriptions to enable us to send them.

To certain countries publications can be sent only directly from the publishers. The Manager of THE MONTH has permission to send them. Whence the added value now of a direct subscription in favour of a missionary.

Readers who are willing to forward their "Month" to a missionary or to provide an annual subscription (14s.) for one to be sent direct to the more distant outposts, are asked to communicate with The Hon. Secretary, "The Month" Forwarding Scheme, 114 Mount Street, Grosvenor Square, London, W.1. Readers *must* enclose a stamped addressed envelope, and all names and addresses, whether of missionaries applying for "The Month," or readers providing it, *shold be printed in capitals*.

SHORT NOTICES

LITURGICAL

IN the introduction to **Your Catholic Language** (Sheed & Ward, 8s. 6d. n.) Miss Mary Perkins assures us that Latin is an easy language and that it can be learnt sufficiently from the Roman Missal. Maybe, she is right: and she has certainly made a bold attempt to persuade us that her verdict is correct. On the left-hand pages of her book we are given the Ordinary of the Mass—with the “Propers,” first for the Advent Mass of Our Lady and then, for Corpus Christi and the black Mass in *Anniversario Defunctorum*. Under the Latin text which is printed clearly in heavy type there is a literal word-to-word translation. On the right-hand pages we have a gradual introduction into the mysteries of Latin grammar and syntax. At the end of the volume are included a simple grammar and a vocabulary.

Whether Miss Perkins has proved her argument this reviewer cannot say. She is far too optimistic in the suggestion that if you read her whole book through and follow its suggestions fully, you will be able to read an Encyclical or a page of Augustine “as easily in Latin as in English.” That is hyperbole. But she has tackled the problem with interest and thoroughness. Catholics who have some time to devote to personal study and have never studied Latin, will find her book most helpful. It is admirably arranged and, of its kind, could scarcely be bettered. In these days when so many Catholics follow Mass with the Missal, she offers a short cut to others who would join their number. Miss Perkins devotes a mere page and a half to the debated question of Latin pronunciation: and in that short compass she commits herself to the “italianate” manner, with *c* as *ch* in *cheer*, before *e*, *i*, *ae*, and *oe*, and *gn* like our English *ni* in *onion*. This is not the more normal rendering of Church Latin, at least in England.

LITERARY

From Fordham University, on the occasion of its first centenary, comes an elegantly produced edition of the famous “De Corona” speech of Demosthenes. **Demosthenes on the Crown** (Fordham University Press, \$2.25) is the official title. The major portion of the volume consists of the original Greek text, on the left-hand pages, and facing them, to the right, the English version, published by Simpson at Oxford in 1882. At the foot of either page can be found the explanatory notes of the 1882 edition. However, the main purpose of this centenary edition is not linguistic, and the second portion is devoted to a detailed rhetorical commentary upon the speech. Each paragraph is analysed; the changing mood of the audience is studied, and the whole address is offered to the student as a masterpiece in the almost forgotten art of rhetoric. Here, in Europe, the formal study of Rhetoric and Oratory has practically vanished. American Jesuits are proving themselves more faithful to the Society’s older tradition which included a course in Eloquence or Rhetoric among the subjects

of its higher education. The European heritage of classical studies is spreading through the Americas; it may even be passing over to the United States, so anxious are British educationalists to be rid of it. And certain it is that some of the best classical research in recent years has been done there. The present volume is worthily printed and produced.

Mr. I. J. Semper is Head of the Department of English Literature at Loras College, Dubuque, in the U.S.A. Some of his collected essays now appear under the general title of **In The Steps of Dante** (Loras College Press, Dubuque, \$1.25). The first two papers—the fruit of wanderings in Italy—are both informed and interesting but we would quarrel with one or two points. The Sybil's cave of the Sixth Aeneid is not by the shores of the Lago Averno but on the opposite side of the monte di Cuma, facing the sea: the latest Italian excavations make this perfectly evident. And then the statement that "Venice has changed but little since Dante's time" is very odd. I doubt whether Dante would agree that Italian Fascism "is a partial realization of his (Dante's) dream of the many being guided by the one." After a somewhat conventional chapter on "The Poetic Approach to Nature" there comes a study of the relations between Shakespeare and St. Thomas More. Following Professors Dover Wilson and R. W. Chambers, Mr. Semper holds that Shakespeare wrote three pages of Anthony Munday's manuscript play, "Sir Thomas More": and, in agreement with Professor Chambers, he considers that Shakespeare's "Richard III" was based upon More's history of that monarch. More's history was a great advance upon previous chronicles; this explains why "Richard III" "possesses an organic unity not to be found in his other chronicle plays." Mr. Semper's essays are pleasantly written.

From Browne and Nolan of Dublin comes a volume of collected essays by Father Stephen J. Brown, S.J., with the general title of **Studies in Life: By and Large** (8s. 6d. n.). Written pleasantly and in a quiet and reflective vein, they range over a wide field. But, by and large, they are studies in the Literature of Life rather than in Life itself. The author has read extensively and with a keen and sensitive appreciation. There are some charming pages on Childhood and the "changed eyes" that develop with maturing years. A chapter on Allowances would make an excellent conference for retreats. And then he guides us skilfully through scores of books that profess to show the way to happiness and to expound the meaning of Life. Nor does he confine himself to books Catholic. He is sufficiently Catholic to consider also non-Catholic and non-Christian writers. He analyses, compares and judges. The result is that we profit by his knowledge and judgment, that we become "bookish," in the better sense of that word, at second-hand. We are brought into contact with a well-stocked, well-ordered and discerning mind. In one paper he speaks—possibly too easily—of seeing Life with poetic eyes. The worker is told he may see from the top of a tram "scenes such as Wordsworth saw from his coach on Westminster Bridge." I saw this river scene only this morning. You could find its like in half a hundred grim industrial towns. And then there

are possibly too many quotations in a few of the essays. This, I think, somewhat weakens their effect.

Of the making of Surveys and Histories of English Literature there is apparently no end, from the monumental and expensive to the sixpenny collection of periods, names and dates. **The Literature of England—A.D. 500 to 1942** (Longmans, 7s. 6d. n.), by W. J. Entwistle and Eric Gillett, lies somewhere between the two. It is a handbook at a price that should make it a boon to students who have begun to tackle our literature seriously or those who wish for a reliable reference book to brush up their knowledge. The authors have wisely divided their task between them, and both are well-equipped for it, not only by wide reading and sound judgment, but by the fact that they have both taught their subject. Their Survey is astonishingly complete and though judgment must necessarily be short, it is not superficial but catholic, and based on a knowledge of more literatures than one. If there is, as we hope, a long-felt want for a comparatively inexpensive handbook which is more than a catalogue, this book will fill it. We can strongly recommend it for use in the Higher Forms of our schools because of its combination in less than 300 pages of history, information and sound judgment.

DEVOTIONAL

Father F. H. Drinkwater's **My Church Book** (B. O. and W., 3s. 6d. n.) has been compiled "for children of First-Communion age and after." It is charmingly produced, with a gaily coloured cover and some admirable illustrations by Gabriel Pippet. The prayers of the Mass are broken up into simple phrases, given in thick letters, and there is a helpful section of before-and-after-Communion-prayers, suitably expressed for the quite young mind. The litany of Our Lady is also dealt with, and also the Stations of the Cross and some visits to the Blessed Sacrament. An admirable present for children between eight and eleven.

For girls and young women, Father Hubert van Zeller, O.S.B., has written a series of prayers, under the title of **Come Lord** (B.O. and W., 3s. n.). There are prayers for Mass, for the Rosary and the Stations of the Cross as well as short prayers for various occasions. The author means them to run simply and to express modern needs. How far he succeeds must remain a question of individual judgment. The reviewer finds a certain want of fusion between familiar phrases and then the rather stilted "because Thou wantest me to," etc. Better to have dropped the second person singular altogether. On page 50 a prayer is given "In Time of Temptation." It is purposely a tongue-twister, to distract the mind from the tempting thought. Prayer and footnote seems to us unsuitable, almost flippant. On the whole, however, the prayer book will be found useful.

PRESENT DAY PROBLEMS

These days we expect a good deal from a book with the title, **The Christian Failure** (Gollancz, 3s. 6d. n.). Christians are somewhat auto-critical at present, and they will accept, and

answer, serious criticism. But Dr. Charles Singer, the author of this volume, is frankly a disappointment. In his preface he admits that the book is a hastily-composed amalgamation of two review articles. At the outset we are led to believe that his version of the Christian failure has to do with the slow reaction of Church authorities to the physical discoveries of Newton. It is an old theme, that has been well hammered by rationalist societies. But it is rather out-of-date at the moment. However, reading further, we discover that this is merely an introduction, though it occupies almost half the book. Apparently, the great failure of latter-day Christians is, in the author's eyes, that they have not done more to oppose anti-Semitism. This is surely an ungrateful accusation. For who have protested—throughout Europe—so manfully against anti-Semitism as the leaders of the various Christian denominations? A recent booklet, published in the United States under the ægis of the "National Conference of Christians and Jews" gives the best answer to this somewhat irresponsible charge. The booklet gives a list of Catholic authorities that have protested against Nazi ill-treatment of Jews. "First, the Pope; then the American Hierarchy in a body; Cardinal Hinsley; the Hierarchy of Holland, jointly; Cardinal Van Roey, of Belgium; the Hierarchy of Germany, in a body, and Bishop von Preysing, Cardinal Faulhaber, Archbishop Groeber, Bishop Dietz, Archbishop Waitz, individually; five Bishops in Italy—those of Turin, Milan, Trieste, Fiume and Padua, and the Archbishop of Bologna; Cardinal Serédi of Budapest; in France, Bishop Theas of Montauban, Archbishop Saliège of Toulouse, Cardinal Gerlier of Lyons, the Hierarchy of Occupied France, jointly; the Papal Nuncio to France, Mgr. Valeri; in Sweden, Bishop Mueller; in Switzerland, Bishop Besson of Fribourg, Geneva and Lausanne; in Spain, Bishop García y Martínez of Calahorra, Archbishop García y García of Valladolid." "A fair index," comments the American paper which reproduced this list "of where the Church stands."

FICTION

The recent death of Miss Enid Dinnis has robbed us of an expert story-writer in her own definitely pious genre. Her latest volume of short stories is entitled **The Betsy Jane of Wapping Stairs** (Sands, 5s. n.). There are sixteen chapters in the book. All of them are pleasantly written and, reading them, you are conscious always that they will leave you with a distinctly religious lesson or sentiment. And yet this is done without forcing, and without too much of the sentimental. They are, for the most part, delicately narrated, and they reveal a quiet, at times whimsical and always understanding, knowledge of human character. Only one of the tales deals with a war incident, and it is an emphasis upon the value of an old man's prayer. A few of the stories are almost modern variants on ancient legends, e.g., "The Singing Woods," "The Ox and the Ass," and "Sister Bernardine Solves the Mystery," and they succeed in capturing something of that coloured and fanciful

atmosphere of their originals. Not all the stories are as successful as these: one or two limp towards their conclusion, e.g., "Tom Pillifer and his Noreen," and "Hector the Second"—stories in which co-incidence is stretched beyond the reasonably probable. But, on the whole, they are bright, helpful and cleverly composed; they can be recommended for wide reading; they will, we feel sure, do much good.

It is not an easy task to write a convincing novel that centres round what one might call the vertical plane, the intimate relationship of a soul to God and the way in which God draws a certain soul closer to Himself by love and suffering, and one may readily pardon the author of such a novel for not achieving perfection. In **The Smiling Madonna** (Cassell, 8s. 6d. n.) Margaret Trouncer has attempted this task, telling the story of the Christian love of a Polish artist and a Russian aristocratic girl, of the artist's masterpiece and his tragic death, of his young widow's self-dedication to the suffering and redeeming Christ. This is in many ways a beautiful book, and the width of setting and varied contrasts of character prevent it becoming a "pious" story in the unpleasant sense. There is plenty of incident and movement in the book and it certainly could not be called dull; but it is perhaps over-intense, in spite of the lighter incidents and conversations, and the apparent laudable wish of the writer to show that true Christianity is not Manichæan and that God made the body too, leads her to insert passages which sometimes strike rather a discordant note and even heighten, through contrast, the general atmosphere of intensity. But the author has undoubtedly a real feeling for suffering and for its potentiality in regard to the spiritual development of the individual, and we hope that she will write again on a theme which will bring help and increased understanding to not a few writers, just as the Polish artist's masterpiece impelled people to pray.

HISTORICAL

While many would associate the name of Monsignor Horace K. Mann with his monumental work on the "Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages," probably few would connect it with a Newcastle school. Yet **The Early Story of St. Cuthbert's Grammar School, Newcastle-upon-Tyne** (B.O. and W., 5s. n.) reminds us that Monsignor Mann was its third Headmaster and governed its destinies over a period of twenty-seven years of continuous development. It was Monsignor Mann's dying wish that Father Charles Hart should write the school's history. This Father Hart has done in the present volume, and indeed no one could be more qualified than he to undertake what is evidently a labour of love. Joining the school staff in the early months of 1881, in the first term of its existence, he devoted himself to its interests for forty years until he left to study for the priesthood. Ties so strong and intimate could never be broken, and Father Hart's interest in the school and its boys is as lively and keen as ever.

In writing these happy and almost haphazard reminiscences, he has lived his life over again with obvious relish—a relish that

he communicates to his readers. He is rightly proud of the growth of the good tree and its solid fruit. "Our list of Old Boys goes well into four figures and contains the names of two Bishops, five out of our twelve Canons, a Monsignor, and many learned Doctors of Divinity and well over a hundred priests, secular and regular. . . . Teaching, Law and Medicine and other professions also claim their share"—all known to Father Hart personally. "Your readers, in the main, will be the men who know you," the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle remarks in his preface. But those who have never met Father Hart and enjoyed his genial personality, can see something of it reflected in these pages.

CATECHETICAL

The problem of the short instruction at early Sunday Masses is well-known. Three minutes available, the audience so mixed. Father F. H. Drinkwater hopes that he may provide a partial solution in his **Catechism at Early Mass** (B.O. and W., 3s. 6d. n.). He takes the catechism up to question 312 and provides 163 short instructions, arranged in neat and "meaty" headings. The method is simple and straightforward and deals with most of the important aspects of the faith. Priests and teachers will find the book handy and helpful.

The **Convert's Catechism** (B.O. and W., 1s. 3d. n.) has been arranged by Father A. Gits, S.J. It is an annotated catechism, that is, with explanatory notes attached to some of the catechism answers. It is intended for the use of converts under instruction and also as an aid to the catechist and teacher. A neat and useful production.

MISCELLANEOUS

Mr. Alan Brodrick's small volume on **North Africa** (Oxford University Press, 3s. 6d. n.) is a useful introduction to those North African lands that are conspicuous in to-day's news. In the main, the book is pleasantly descriptive, with just sufficient history thrown gently in to provide an intelligible background. All the chapters but two deal with the past: and those two are somewhat fearful and pessimistic. The book was composed, of course, before the recent military transformation of the Mediterranean scene. Mr. Brodrick's comments on Algerian nationalist movements are illuminating. These movements have a real basis, and their aim is religious reform and national independence. The Moslem of North West Africa looks naturally to Egypt, which he now sees governing its own affairs: and his eyes wander onwards to Iraq; Sa'udi Arabia and now Syria. Axis agents have tried to acerbate this nationalist feeling against the French, but with little result. Since 1941 the French authorities have proceeded with the project of a Trans-Saharan railway; and new motor-roads and air-fields have been constructed. The German intention, Mr. Brodrick considers, was eventually to use these new routes and fields as a bridgehead to South America. These plans have been for a time—be it hoped, permanently—smashed. Mr. Brodrick ventures one or two unfortunate remarks from Church

history. These should be ignored. It is a trifle curious to find St. Augustine saddled with "an almost Protestant insistence upon the value of the individual judgment."

Mr. Hilaire Belloc is a national as well as a Catholic personality. It was fitting, therefore, that his seventy-second birthday should have been commemorated in a special volume. Its title is **For Hilaire Belloc** (Sheed and Ward, 9s. n.) and it contains a series of essays by prominent Catholic authors. They are nearly all historical essays. Mr. Douglas Woodruff, editor of the *Tablet*, is their *compère*. The essays are charming pieces, as befits a commemorative volume to the greatest of living English essayists. Most of them have no direct reference to Mr. Belloc, but Mr. Douglas Jerrold does treat of Mr. Belloc as the prophet and herald of the counter-Revolution. Then we stray, with Monsignor Knox, to the curious story of George Townsend, D.D., Canon of Durham, who went to Rome to convert the Pope and have him summon a General Council. Mr. Lunn speaks of Alpine mysticism, with a hint of snow and sunflush on Monte Rosa in the background. Cicely, Duchess of York, Trollope and André Chenier are other subjects of these essays. Bishop Mathew contributes a detailed and graceful study of the Howard library at Naworth, and Father Gervase Mathew, O.P., builds a bridge between medieval Oxford and Byzantium. The longest, and the most detailed, of these essays is that of David Jones on "The Myth of Arthur." The volume is well edited and produced.

Margaret Cropper's **New Life** (Longmans, 2s. 6d. n.) is a collection of quiet passages and prayers. All such collections are bound to be subjective and personal. This one is charmingly put together and will, we are sure, help those who use it, to turn their thoughts to God and to reflect on the things of the Spirit.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

The latest batch of C.T.S. pamphlets (3d. each) includes one on **Angels: Facts not Fancies**, by Father F. C. Devas, S.J. The author is interested in showing just what can be stated about the Angels with scriptural and theological warrant. He points out that the term "angel" denotes the office rather than the nature of these spirits. He treats of the purpose of Angels, and of Guardian Angels, and of what they do for us, and our duties in their regard. A compact and valuable pamphlet.

From the American Catechetical Guild comes a novel experiment. It is calculated that every month fifteen million copies of "comic strips" are sold in the United States. Father Louis Gales, the editor of the *Catholic Digest*, now tries to baptize these strips by publishing a Catholic variant, with the name of *Topix*. Each number consists of eight pages of small and highly coloured pictures, telling the story of some saint. The number before us (the third of the venture) gives the life-story of Father Damien, and does it briskly and vividly. It is a new method of the children's apostolate.

Among recent publications of the Sword of the Spirit are the following: **Christian Freedom**, by Christopher Dawson, a reprint

of an article in the *Dublin Review*, which deserves close study : **Remember France**, an excellently written pamphlet by Robert Speaight, reminding us that our association with France in the cause of liberty and culture is of the highest importance for post-war Europe and also that a Catholic revival is most likely to spring out of French soil. These two pamphlets are published by Sands and priced 3d. The article on **The Education Question**, by A. C. F. Beales, from *THE MONTH* of January-February of 1943, is a further pamphlet (4d. n.). It is an admirable compendium of information on the highly topical Education question. A fourth pamphlet (4d. n.) makes available for English readers the full text of the statement, published last autumn in the United States, from representative Catholics of many European countries.

No. 63 of the "Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs" takes the form of **An Atlas of the U.S.A.** (Oxford University Press, 6d. n.). It is an admirable production, for all its tiny compass, and it provides handy information for the busy Englishman who has little time these days for thumbing an encyclopædia or an atlas. There are 19 maps, and plans, and each of them has its parallel script, composed by Mr. Jasper H. Stembridge, Geographical Editor of the Oxford Press. The centre of this short atlas has a striking double-page map which gives a bird's eye view of the U.S.A. in its relation to the rest of the Northern Hemisphere. Other charts illustrate physical and political divisions and the gradual expansion across the American Continent. The pamphlet is a sound "biscuit" introduction to the land and people of the United States.

No. 64 of the same series deals with **The British Pacific Islands**, and is contributed by Sir Harry Luke, K.C.M.G., who was Governor of Malta from 1930 to 1938 and then, from 1938 to 1942, was Governor of Fiji and High Commissioner for the Western Pacific. After some general remarks on the Pacific and its islands as well as concerning the Pacific native races and their reactions to the White Man, the author gives us the situation and the recent history of the Solomon, Gilbert and Ellice islands, and of Fiji and the kingdom of Tonga. The war effort of the islanders is worth careful attention. Altogether a very useful pamphlet, compressed into a neat and handy format.

Among the latest C.T.S. pamphlets several call for notice. Father Edmund Sutcliffe's scholarly article, from a recent number of the *Clergy Review*, now re-appears under the title of **Who Perished in the Flood?** The late Father Vincent McNabb discusses the important apologetic question, **Did Jesus Christ Rise from the Dead?** The theme is admirably treated and the pamphlet provides just that ready answer we require for the casual objector. An eloquent survey of **Science : Providence : Prayer**, by a layman, who remains anonymous, is encouraging as well as informative. Father Leonard Boase, S.J., has collected together consoling thoughts for these war-harried days in **Freedom of Heart**. Mr. Walter Jewell writes a convincing account of the Church's attitude towards **Divorce**. Finally, we are brought back to the present problem of our Catholic schools in the Bishop of Pella's succinct and powerful leaflet on **The Case for the Catholic School**.